City of Oxford OHIO
HOME OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY

Agenda

Oxford City Council

Court House

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2015

EXECUTIVE SESSION
None.

1. Roll call. Kevin McKeehan, Mayor; Kate Rousmaniere, Vice-Mayor; Mike Smith; Bob Blackburn; Steve Snyder; Richard Keebler; Edna Southard

---

MEETING PROCEDURE: Comments from the Public are welcome at two different times during the course of the meeting: (1) Comments on items not on the Agenda, and Consent Agenda items, will be heard under Public Comments – and (2) Comments on all Resolutions and Ordinances will be heard during Council consideration of said item. Please wait until you are recognized by the Mayor, proceed to the podium, state your name and address so that your comments may be properly recorded and limit your remarks to a period of five minutes or less.

REGULAR MEETING
7:30 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. Approval of Agenda.

This facility is wheelchair accessible. If you plan to attend this meeting and you have a disability that requires special arrangements, please notify the City Manager's office 48 hours in advance so that reasonable accommodations can be made.

3. Public Participation.

   A. Proclamation - 'Gail Paveza Day'

   Proclamation

   B. Public Comments.

   The purpose of the Public Comments Section is for members of the Public to speak to the City Council on any subject not scheduled on the Agenda, except Consent Agenda items. City Council values your comments, and Council rules limit public comments to five minutes for each person. Presentations are not to be in the form of public debate, personal attacks on Council, City staff or other members of the public and Council shall not act except to direct the City Manager to take action or schedule the matter for discussion at a later date.

4. Consent Agenda.

   A. Minutes of the November 3, 2015 City Council Meeting. (Mary Ann Eaton, Clerk of Council)

   Minutes

   B. Report regarding the November 4, 2015 Environmental Commission Meeting. (Mike Dreisbach, Service Director)

   Report

   C. A Resolution amending Resolution No. 4943 declaring certain City property no longer needed for municipal purposes as surplus and authorizing the sale of said items to the highest bidder utilizing GovDeals, Inc. The proceeds thereof shall be deposited in the Fire/EMS Fund. (John Detherage, Fire Chief)

   Staff Report/Resolution

   D. A Resolution authorizing the City Manager to request advanced payment of property taxes to the City in 2016 from Butler County. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

   Staff Report/Resolution

5. Resolutions.

   1. A Resolution of Council adopting the Amendment to the Government Aggregation Master Retail Supply Agreement between the City of Oxford and AEP Energy, Inc. which permits AEP Energy, Inc. to conduct subsequent opt-outs at various times throughout the remaining term of the agreement (refresh opt-outs). (Doug Elliott, City Manager)

   Staff Report/Resolution

   2. A Resolution authorizing a temporary abatement of the Noise Ordinance No. 2550, Section 509.09, on Thursday, April 14, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. on Friday,

April 15, 2016 at Millett Hall on Miami University's campus for the WGI Sport of the Arts Drum Line Competition. (Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director)

Staff Report/Resolution

3. A Resolution authorizing the City Manager to waive parking meter fees on High Street, East Park Place, West Park Place, Poplar Street, Main Street and Beech Street between Walnut Street and Church Street, and in the southern (2-hr) section of Lot 52 from 9:00 a.m. on December 14, 2015 until 6:00 p.m. on December 31, 2015. The two hour restriction for meters in these locations will remain in effect. (Bob Holzworth, Police Chief)

Staff Report/Resolution

6. Ordinances.

A. First Reading.

1.An Ordinance Repealing Oxford Codified Ordinance Section 141.04 Entitled Police Advisory Board, And Adopting New Oxford Codified Ordinance Section 141.04 Entitled Police Community Relations And Review Commission. (Doug Elliott, City Manager)

Staff Report/Ordinance

B. Second Reading.

1.An Ordinance Approving A Conditional Use Permit To Allow For Shared-Use Parking Between Two Adjacent Lots At 10 University Avenue Oxford, Ohio 45056 with Conditions. (Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director)

Staff Report/Ordinance

2.An Ordinance Accepting The Planning Commission's Recommendation For Preliminary Plan Approval Of A Planned Development For One (1) Acre Of Land At 5990 Contreras Road Oxford, Ohio 45056 To Allow The Reconfiguration Of An Existing Structure For Residential and Office Uses With Conditions. (Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director)

Staff Reports/Ordinance

3.An Ordinance To Make Appropriations For Current Expenses And Other Expenditures Of The City Of Oxford, State Of Ohio, During The Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Staff Report/Ordinance

4.An Ordinance Outlining Budgeted Transfers For The City Of Oxford, State Of Ohio, During The Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Staff Report/Ordinance

5.An Ordinance Outlining Budgeted Advances For The City Of Oxford, State Of Ohio, During The Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Staff Report/Ordinance

6.An Ordinance Adopting Fees And Charges For Fiscal Year 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Staff Report/Ordinance

7. A. Announcements & Communications.

1. Recognition for service on City Council - Richard Keebler and Steve Snyder. (Mayor McKeehan)

2. Remarks from City Council and City Staff.

B. Future Meetings.

WED - Nov 18 Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting 7:30 p.m.

FRI - Nov 20 Student Community Relations Commission Meeting 2:30 p.m. LCNB

TUES - Nov 24 City Council Organizational Meeting 7:00 p.m.

WED - Nov 25 Civil Service Commission Meeting Cancelled

THUR -Nov 26 Holiday - City Offices Closed

FRI - Nov 27 Holiday - City Offices Closed

TUES - Dec 1 City Council Meeting 7:30 p.m.

WED - Dec 2 Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission Meeting 6:00 p.m.

WED - Dec 2 Environmental Commission Meeting 7:00 p.m. Municipal Building

TUES - Dec 8 Planning Commission Meeting 7:30 p.m.

TUES - Dec 15 City Council Meeting 7:30 p.m.

WED - Dec 16 Civil Service Commission Meeting 5:30 p.m. Municipal Building

WED - Dec 16 Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting 7:30 p.m.

MON - Dec 21 Housing Advisory Commission Meeting 7:00 p.m. Municipal Building

THUR -Dec 24 Holiday - City Offices Closed

FRI - Dec 25 Holiday - City Offices Closed

8. Adjourn.

Office of the Mayor

Proclamation

Whereas: Gail Paveza was born and raised in Chicago, Illinois and graduated from the University of Illinois at Chicago; and

WHEREAS, Gail recently retired from the Follett Corporation after forty eight years of dedicated service to the corporation and to her customers; and

WHEREAS, Gail held a variety of management positions with Follett's and relocated eight times. In 1998 she accepted the position of Store Director at Follett's Miami Co-Op Bookstore for what was to be her final move; and

WHEREAS, Gail has a genuine interest in the community of Oxford and has given of her time to volunteer her services in a multitude of ways including service to the Kiwanis Club as a member and past president, serving on the Board of Directors for the Oxford Visitors Bureau, and on the Board of Directors for the Oxford Museum Association; and

WHEREAS, Gail has represented the Chamber of Commerce on the Student Community Relations Commission and is currently a member of the Citizens Observer Patrol of Oxford; and

WHEREAS, Gail looks forward to continuing to participate in and volunteer at events in Oxford and looks forward to attending more Miami University sporting events, especially Hockey; and

WHEREAS, Gail has given of her personal time and energy to serve both Follett's and the Oxford community and we miss seeing her cheerfully sweeping the sidewalks in front of the store every morning.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Kevin D. McKeehan, Mayor of the City of Oxford, Ohio, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, November 18, 2015:

"GAIL PAVEZA DAY"

in the City of Oxford and encourage all citizens of Oxford to congratulate Ms. Paveza on her special day.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Oxford to be affixed this 17th day of November 2015.

KEVIN D. MCKEEHAN, MAYOR

A Regular meeting of the Oxford City Council was called to order by Mayor Kevin McKeehan on Tuesday, November 3, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. Those members present were Bob Blackburn, Richard Keebler, Mike Smith, Steve Snyder and Edna Southard. Kate Rousmaniere was excused.

Staff members present: Mr. Doug Elliott, City Manager; Mr. Mike Dreisbach, Service Director; Mr. John Jones, Police Lieutenant; Mr. Joe Newlin, Finance Director; Mr. John Detherage, Fire Chief; Mr. Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director; Mr. Alan Kyger, Economic Development Director; Mr. Steve McHugh, Law Director and Ms. Mary Ann Eaton, Clerk of Council.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor McKeehan requested the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Snyder moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Blackburn seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

NOTICE TO LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Transfer permit from Oxford Johnnys Inc. 1st Floor only Unit A 209 E. Sycamore St. Oxford, Ohio 45056 to KSDA LLC DBA Johnnys Campus Deli 1st Floor only Unit A 209 E. Sycamore St. Oxford, Ohio 45056.

Mr. Kyger noted a change in ownership of the business in question and therefore the liquor permits would be transferred into the new owners' name.

Mr. Snyder moved to accept the notice without comment. Mr. Blackburn seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Kathleen Zien, Joseph Drive, read the following into the record (in part): there's no accountability with Council or review boards if dozens of eyes watch from this end of the room even if citizens are present that don't speak that makes a statement with full audience listening. If I nod or shake my head I'm overlooked but if you're staring at 5 rows of angry or apathetic people your response in voting may change. Nothing would be better than standing room only at City meetings, it shows real commitment to wait in line at the podium for public comments or agenda items. Sometimes City Council meetings are 23 minutes start to finish. Although consent agendas streamline meetings it wasn't unusual for the first 10 years I attended that a vote was taken at 11:00 p.m. to continue past midnight. Often I was the only one to address Council or the only observer at BZA or HAPC that wasn't the applicant. In 30 years I can count on one hand the Councilors who've attended BZA even once to observe their semi-judicial proceedings for a board that you delegate. I've sat through more City meetings in 30 years than most Councilors combined giving me a history and a good memory.

A "Citizen of the Year" nomination noted when no one on Council or staff knew what happened on a particular issue because it predated their tenure, Kathleen could cite the information needed because she had been there 5 or 15 years earlier. When staff checked minutes they verified her information was correct. It isn't easy here, it takes hours to type, edit and whittle down words for 5 minutes. I know my word count to read at break-neck speed. If you watch the second hand as soon as I start speaking you'll never hear or listen to what I say. If there was a line of people waiting behind me for their 5 minutes that would be one thing, but rarely is anyone here. There's never a line to get here, there's little interest, students attend for class credit. If others offered diverse, factual, challenging or supportive views I'd welcome them as should Council. I attended the recent Candidates Forum WMUB no longer broadcasts live and there was a change of format. School Board Candidates, Township Trustees and City Councilors sat at tables where people met them. Of Oxford's 21,000 population only 7 people came to meet the Council Candidates. What's that tell you? Understandably people feel Councilors, Planners and boards won't listen, if they watch tapes they feel they will be chastised as I've been. Some tell me "I would have said what you did but I'm afraid to speak in public". If Council hears from anyone even 3 sentences is better than silence. Any citizen who has the nerve, stamina or prepares for City meetings should be welcomed and not belittled. I've applauded smart comments and appropriate votes at Council. I've been in the audience when male senior citizens have spoken 8-10 minutes uninterrupted, no one looks at the clock, no one stops them, no Councilor gets impatient or has a tantrum. Some female citizens have exceeded the hallowed 5 minutes. Whether it's intentional or not there's a double standard. Whether men are favored, whether selective or sexist, it happens and we notice. The agent who will speak tonight for Contreras Road took 21 minutes with his presentation at Planning October 13th. He would have been given another 21 minutes if he wanted. Presentations take time but so do rebuttals. At that meeting I was reprimanded. Mr. Keebler abruptly chimed in at 5 minutes to have me stop yet there wouldn't be any other citizen that would be speaking. It was too much of an outburst to be overlooked and without this follow-up. I understand Planners talked about the incident after the meeting but were equally startled when it happened and couldn't react quickly enough. The one page staff report won't capture it, the minutes might but those take a month to get printed. Fast forward to that taped portion of the October 13th Planning Commission meeting on Oxford on Demand. I've been defended over a dozen times by previous Councilors to Mayors and they've said Kathleen spends more time doing research and background checks than all of us combined and I want to hear what she found. If only someone did that homework for me. Dick, as we see it from this side of the room we know your mind is often made up before you get to a meeting. We've come to know your impatience, we know you're counting the days until your pending step-down from Council and Planning Commission. We welcome you to this side of the room and hope to see you often with us mere mortals. Then you'll know the courage and guts it takes to get up here without glory. I do think Mrs. Keebler would have been surprised, disappointed, or both at your outburst to a citizen, any citizen in a meeting.'

CONSENT AGENDA

MINUTES

Minutes of the October 20, 2015 City Council Meeting. (Mary Ann Eaton, Clerk of Council)

REPORTS

Report regarding the October 13, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting. (Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director)

Report regarding the October 15, 2015 Parks and Recreation Board Meeting. (Gail Brahier, Parks and Recreation Director)

Report regarding the October 21, 2015 Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting. (Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director)

Report regarding the October 28, 2015 Civil Service Commission Meeting. (Candi Turpin, Human Resources Director)

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION AGREEMENT WITH T-2 SYSTEMS

A Resolution No. 4942 authorizing the City Manager to enter into a three (3) year software subscription agreement with T-2 Systems, Inc. for the use of software utilized by the City of Oxford's Parking Unit at a total cost of $48,359.35. (Bob Holzworth, Police Chief)

RESOLUTION SURPLUS EQUIPMENT

A Resolution No. 4943 declaring certain City property no longer needed for municipal purposes as surplus and authorizing the sale of said items to the highest bidder utilizing GovDeals, Inc. (John Detherage, Fire Chief)

Mr. Blackburn moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Smith seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION MUNICIPAL AGGREGATION

A Resolution No. 4944 of Council adopting the Amended Plan of Operation and Governance for the City of Oxford's Municipal Electric Aggregation Program which permits opt-outs at various times throughout the term of the contract. (Doug Elliott, City Manager)

Mr. Elliott advised a Draft Plan of Operation and Governance was presented at the Public Hearings in December 2014 and he and Eagle Energy were proposing that an additional paragraph be added to the Draft Plan of Operation and Governance which would permit "subsequent opt-outs" at various times throughout the term of the contract. Mr. Elliott recommended that City Council adopt by resolution the Amended Plan of Operation and Governance.

Mr. Elliott noted under the amended plan, subsequent letters would only be mailed to addresses where the customer was included in the City's Electric Aggregation Program last spring but moved out at a later date (primarily student housing) and the account returned to the Duke standard service rate. Mr. Elliott advised the letters would not be mailed to residents who are already in the program or who opted-out. Mr. Elliott noted enrollment in the program declined over 50% in August of 2015 and providing the subsequent opt-out letter would make it more convenient for students to participate in the City's Electric Aggregation Program. Mr. Elliott advised during student move-in this fall staff met with a lot of students who showed interest in the program and when they receive the opt-out letter they can return it only if they decide not to participate in the program.

Mr. Keebler noted if the account reverted to the Duke standard rate the tenant should receive an opt-in letter not an opt-out letter. Mr. Elliott advised the electors voted for an opt-out program. Mr. Keebler clarified that once the opt-out letter was issued the account would go back into the aggregation program unless the customer decided to opt-out.

Mr. Snyder noted the City was following the state statute.

Mr. Blackburn noted it would be helpful to know when the letters would be mailed and Mr. Elliott advised he would keep Miami's Secretary for Off Campus Affairs apprised.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public and there were none.

Mr. Smith moved to adopt Resolution No. 4944. Mr. Blackburn seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION
DISPATCH SERVICES

A Resolution No. 4945 authorizing the City Manager to enter into an agreement for the Board of Commissioners of Butler County, Ohio to provide dispatch services for the City of Oxford pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Sections 307.15 and 307.16. (Doug Elliott, City Manager)

Mr. Elliott advised Butler Council presently had five Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) which were the Butler County Sheriff's Office; the cities of Middletown, Fairfield, and Oxford; and West Chester Township. Mr. Elliott noted the Butler County 911 Planning Committee was required to reduce the number of PSAPs to four by January 1, 2016 or risk a 50% reduction in funding. Mr. Elliott advised of the five current Butler County PSAPs , the City of Oxford received the lowest volume of 911 calls (2.3% in 2014). Mr. Elliott noted given the need of the Butler County 911 Planning Committee to reduce the number of PSAPs to four in 2016 and the low volume of 911 calls which the City of Oxford receives, he, Chief Holzworth and Lt. Jones began discussions with representatives of the Butler County Sheriff's Office regarding the possibility of them providing safety dispatch services to the City of Oxford. Mr. Elliott noted this option was discussed with City Council during the August, 2015 Council Strategic Planning Retreat. Mr. Elliott advised staff approached this option with three goals in mind:

1. Any new service proposed must be at least equal to or better than what is presently provided.
2. There must be some cost savings.
3. Consider options for existing employees and keep them informed throughout the process.

Mr. Elliott noted he believed all three goals had been achieved. Mr. Elliott advised the cost savings to the City under the proposed contract and operational restructuring was estimated to be minimal as the cost savings was dependent on the actual reduction in positions, overtime, and contracted services, as well as, the cost of the proposed agreement. Mr. Elliott noted the cost of the proposed agreement with the BCSO was $336,000 for the first year with 5% increases for the following two years and the CPI-U each year after. Mr. Elliott advised staff's goal was to make the transition for the public and the employees as seamless as possible by January 1, 2016. Mr. Elliott noted the City of Hamilton contracted with the BCSO in 2013 for the provision of safety dispatch services and had been pleased with the service provided. Mr. Elliott advised Matt Franke from the BCSO and Lt. Jones were in attendance to answer any questions.

Mr. Matt Franke, Butler County Sheriff's Office, noted Mr. Elliott's summation was very good and offered to answer any questions.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public and there were none.

Mr. Snyder inquired if the transition would be complete by January 1, 2016. Mr. Elliott advised there may be some phasing of the initiative noting Mr. Franke had approval to pay for the transitional costs but needed to wait until Council approved the contract between the City and the Butler County Commissioners. Mr. Elliott advised staff had a lot of work ahead of them in transitioning the employees in the current Dispatch positions into their new roles. Mr. Elliott noted he was confident the details would be worked out and someone would still be on duty 24/7. Mr. Snyder advised the City of Oxford currently dispatched for Oxford Township and inquired how that would be handled and who would pay for it. Mr. Elliott advised Butler County would dispatch for the township and the 911 Committee needed to look at how the townships would participate in cost sharing. Mr. Snyder inquired how the transition would affect the Miami University Police Department. Mr. Elliott advised MUPD was a secondary PSAP and the City of Oxford was currently receiving their 911 calls. Lt. Jones advised calls going to MUPD for ambulance or fire service would be transferred to Butler County dispatch instead of MUPD transferring the call to the City of Oxford dispatch. Lt. Jones noted if a student called 911 from a cell phone it would automatically go to Butler County dispatch and they would process the call. Mr. Elliott advised Miami University staff and MUPD had been kept apprised of the transition.

Mayor McKeehan noted he wished the City could keep its own dispatch center but he was confident Butler County would do a fine job.

Mr. Keebler noted the City of Hamilton was leery about combining their dispatch center with Butler County but with the amount of mutual aid and the amount of inter-connection available today he felt the county had done a very good job. Mr. Keebler advised the savings might not be significant to start with but as equipment needed replaced there could be some significant cost avoidance in the future. Mr. Keebler noted he was pleased someone would be on duty 24/7 in the Oxford dispatch center and still see a cost savings.

Mr. Snyder moved to adopt Resolution No. 4945. Mr. Smith seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION
CONTRACT WITH
DONALD W. MAY CONTRACTING, INC.

A Resolution No. 4946 accepting the bid and authorizing the City Manager to enter into a contract with Donald W. May Contracting, Inc. for the replacement of an existing ten (10) inch cast iron water main with a new twelve (12) inch ductile iron water main from Southpointe Parkway to Booth Road and from Booth Road to the main terminus at N. Law Road at a cost of $699,088.50 plus a contingency amount of ten percent (10%) of the contract price or $69,908.00 for a total cost not to exceed $768,996.50. (Mike Dreisbach, Service Director)

Mr. Dreisbach advised as part of the US 27 S. widening and safety project from Chestnut Street to Southpointe Parkway, that stretch included a new 12 inch ductile water main. Mr. Dreisbach noted beyond Southpointe Parkway the water main was an old cast iron pipe in very poor condition. Mr. Dreisbach advised the City planned for the replacement of this section of pipe and budgeted $974,000 for the replacement project. Mr. Dreisbach noted the City obtained a grant from the Ohio Public Works Commission to pay project costs up to 50% of the contract price. Mr. Dreisbach advised the City advertised and received 15 bids for the project with Donald W. May Contracting, Inc. providing the lowest bid. Mr. Dreisbach noted Donald W. May Contracting, Inc. had a strong reputation and did a lot of work for the Butler County Engineer's Office. Mr. Dreisbach recommended Council award the entire project to Donald W. May Contracting, Inc.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public and there were none.

Mr. Keebler noted the bid was under budget and the company had a good reputation.

Mr. Snyder advised the project had been included in the 5 year CIP.

Mr. Smith moved to adopt Resolution No. 4946. Mr. Blackburn seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

ORDINANCES
FIRST READING

ORDINANCE
CONDITIONAL USE

An Ordinance Approving A Conditional Use Permit To Allow For Shared-Use Parking Between Two Adjacent Lots At 10 University Avenue Oxford, Ohio 45056 With Conditions.(Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director)

Mr. Chen advised the Conditional Use Permit application came about through an application to build an addition to the rear of 10 University Avenue. Mr. Chen noted the building straddled 4 parcels and the garage being used for 10 University Avenue was not on the same lot as the home. Mr. Chen advised the zoning code required parking and site access conditions be brought into compliance as part of an addition to a structure.

Mr. Chen noted the Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions that the lots be consolidated and an easement be established and recorded for the off-site parking. Mr. Chen offered to answer any questions.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the petitioner, the public or Council and there were none.

ORDINANCE
PRELIMINARY PLANNED
DEVELOPMENT

An Ordinance Accepting The Planning Commission's Recommendation For Preliminary Plan Approval Of A Planned Development For One (1) Acre Of Land At 5990 Contreras Road Oxford, Ohio 45056 To Allow The Reconfiguration Of An Existing Structure For Residential and Office Uses With Conditions. (Jung-Han Chen, Community Development Director)

Mr. Chen advised the proposed Ordinance was for a Preliminary Planned Development at 5990 Contreras Road, at the corner of Contreras Road and Jacqueline Drive. Mr. Chen noted the proposal was to create 3 dwellings and a professional office. Mr. Chen advised the building was built in 1890 and had significant historic features. Mr. Chen advised the City's Comprehensive Plan emphasized historic preservation when dealing with land use applications. Mr. Chen noted some of the neighbors were concerned about the proposal and primarily about what the office use might be. Mr. Chen advised the Planning Commission spent a great deal of time discussing the proposal and voted 4-0-0 to recommend approval with the following conditions:

1. The use shall be limited to a maximum of 3 dwelling units (the current efficiency apartment and 2 additional units) or 2 dwelling units (the current efficiency apartment and 1 additional unit) and 1 professional office (limited to those uses specifically enumerated in Oxford Zoning Code Section 1159.17).
2. Maximum occupancy of any dwelling unit for which a rental permit is required shall be 4 persons, no more than two of which may be unrelated unless constituting a family as allowed in Oxford Zoning Code Sections 1146.02(a) and 1146.02(b).
3. The office use shall be limited to a maximum of 2,500 square feet.
4. Any sign for the Professional Office shall conform to Oxford Zoning Code Section 1151.05(a)(1) except only a free-standing sign will be permitted and the design of the sign shall be in harmony with the historic character of the home.
5. The footprint of the home shall not be expanded, and the exterior of the home shall be maintained as closely as possible to how it currently exists, with changes only as required to meet current building and fire codes for ingress/egress of the new uses and any required changes shall be designed and constructed in consideration and observance of the historical features of the structure.
6. The hours of operation of the professional office shall be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
7. The Planned Development shall in all other respects comply with Oxford Zoning Code Section 1143.09 RO Office Residential District.

Mr. Chen offered to answer any questions and noted the applicant would make a presentation as well.

Mr. Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent, advised the property in question was originally 13 acres outside City limits and his clients (Pete and Connie McCarthy) were the third owners of the property. Mr. Webb noted the owners had done a marvelous job renovating and constantly improving the property. Mr. Webb advised everything around the property had changed dramatically and noted there was R3 development across Jacqueline Drive, single-family across Contreras Road and a lodging house on the diagonal that had been approved through the Planned Development process for more intense housing use. Mr. Webb advised the property in question was zoned R1B bordered by everything imaginable. Mr. Webb noted the property had been conforming most of its life until 2003 when the zoning map amendment changed the property to R1B making it a nonconforming use. Mr. Webb advised that was further complicated by changes to the nonconforming use section of the code which severely hampered any modifications to a nonconforming property. Mr. Webb noted the house was over 5,000 square feet with a 400 square foot efficiency apartment over the attached garage and the zoning map amendment prohibited further division of the property. Mr. Webb advised the nonconforming section of the code required an occupancy reduction if the house was reconfigured. Mr. Webb noted in a R1B district professional offices were not allowed other than a home occupation which only allowed one employee. Mr. Webb noted this was a beautiful home with a lot of square footage and not a lot of options on what to do with it. Mr. Webb advised his clients attempted to change the zoning on two occasions which were denied and now they were attempting the Planned Development approach. Mr. Webb noted the Planned Development approach would open options for adaptive reuse of the property and a Planned Development would protect the City in a way a zoning change would not. Mr. Webb advised the Planned Development approach would give adjacent property owners, planners and Council assurance that his clients were "freezing in time" what was allowed on the property and they have taken away the mystery of a more intense development in this location. Mr. Webb noted because this was a large property the current R1B zoning would allow it to be subdivided into three lots which would allow three single family homes with a maximum occupancy of 12 on one acre. Mr. Webb advised his clients were asking for (with the Planning Commission's recommended conditions) a maximum of 5 occupants on one acre and the possibility for a professional office. Mr. Webb noted if his clients were to subdivide the property there was no guarantee the existing house would remain. Mr. Webb advised he and his clients felt and the Planning Commission agreed the proposal was similar to uses around it and it provided opportunity for adaptive reuse of the property and the application met all of the requirements for a Planned Development. Mr. Webb noted his clients agreed to comply with the conditions proposed by the Planning Commission and any changes in the future required Planning Commission review. Mr. Webb advised he felt the City was protected by this proposal and the owners had options to save the structure.

Ms. Marsha Haffey, 5106 Bonham Road, noted Council might wonder why someone who lived on the other side of town cared about a change in a residential area at 5990 Contreras Road. Ms. Haffey advised she was thinking the same thing at 2 a.m. when she was trying to go to sleep with the glare from the lights at the Beta Headquarters. Ms. Haffey noted she lived in a neighborhood with a non-residential facility and for the most part the Beta Headquarters was not an inconvenience. Ms. Haffey advised this time of year the lights from the Beta Headquarters parking lot and security lights glared into her bedroom windows. Ms. Haffey noted she had to hang light blocking drapes and cover her beautiful windows. Ms. Haffey advised she felt a person was allowed to have security and comfort in their own home without having surrounding facilities interceding and that included getting a good night's sleep.

Ms. Haffey noted a non-resident should not be among private homes and she hoped Council would not approve this request as it was not good for the neighborhood.

Mr. Bill Fisher, 4883 James Road, noted in listening to the presentation he greatly appreciated the effort that Scott Webb and the Planning Commission had put into making this proposal more conforming to what the community would see possible. Mr. Fisher advised as he heard the proposed changes would allow the building to be saved, he wondered, saved from what. Mr. Fisher noted maybe from the owners themselves as he knew they wished to sell the lot and it had not sold in a number of years. Mr. Fisher advised he did not know the exact value the owners were asking for or what they bought the house for. Mr. Fisher noted the imaginations seemed to be getting back to the same thing talked about in 2010 and sounded very much like spot zoning again. Mr. Fisher advised a house behind his on Contreras Road was well over an acre and he would not want it to become this type of arrangement. Mr. Fisher encouraged Council to vote against the proposed change.

Ms. Kathleen Zien, Joseph Drive, read the following into the record (in part): for the third time the owners are working the system with an end-run around Oxford zoning. This property wasn't appropriate for office rezoning in 2010 and was denied. This August a unanimous denial for multi-family never headed to Council. The ink wasn't dry on the denial before Webb applied August 28th for this one. The individual requests previously inappropriate and unacceptable that would degrade this area were rightfully denied by City boards. This request combines the worst of both rejects asking for office use with 12 hours of operation and multi-residential. New wordsmithing calling it a Planned Development is a shrewd way to get on the agenda and around the reality of a spot zone. Office and rental units would be the demise of the home. Once Pandora's Box is open it will never return to single-family again. Splitting it into units will irrevocably change the building, grounds and the area. I don't think the owners care about maintaining neighborhoods. Oxford has 11 approved overlay districts with another pending. McCarthy is the one Planning Commission member who is the lone no vote for any and all overlay districts and didn't sign the petition for ours. It's one thing to sit on the price unsold if it didn't affect anyone else but when its been overpriced for years so they can use that as an alibi to change zoning that's the issue and insult. Before Council considers a irrevocable change to this home, this corner, this neighborhood go right to the source and hold the owners accountable for putting you in this position by deliberately overpricing the house using that as an excuse to say it can only be mixed use. I found it interesting when Mr. Webb said we've attempted this zoning, we've attempted that zoning and this is our third time. He failed to say they never attempted to price it right. Neither Council or Planning Commission members should feel responsible to default to this request when owners have never done their part to sell it for where it is and what it is. Spot rezoning to increase one persons property value is not the responsibility of Planning Commission or Council. It is your joint responsibility not to degrade or decrease adjoining property values by your decisions. According the an Ohio Supreme Court Ruling, singling out a lot or small area for discriminatory or different treatment from surrounding land similar in character can not be considered if it serves to benefit one particular individual. The implied threat has been if you don't grant this we can split the lot, tear down the house and put in more buildings. If so, the community at large not just the immediate neighborhood will like them even less. With the historic designation the house has been given that might be difficult.

The house is not an anomaly but would be if a business open 12 hours with possibly 9-12 residents and mandatory parking for 11-14 is permitted. It's an unacceptable number of on site parking spaces on this residential corner that negatively transforms the look of the house and the grounds forever. Please note the site plan on page 103 that has 4 slant parking spaces proposed on what's currently the side and front lawn. That is not 'freezing the property in time'. The house including the attic is said to be 5,000 square feet. Yet, under condition #3 on page 75 office space may be up to 2,500 square feet. The entire 1st floor including the sun-room addition is 1,974 square feet. Where would a 2,500 square foot office space be? The applicant uses white coated professionals, architects and lawyers as bait for office use. There's no doctor in the wings practicing until 8:00 p.m. Children and senior daycare centers can last into the evening as can barber and beauty shops, massage, nail and tattoo parlors and dance studios and all are permitted uses. In the staff report on page 85, Mr. Chen says the property feels like a 'mini-homestead'. That should have been the selling point. Mr. Chen, the size of the house and the lot is not unattractive for single-family since its been just that for over 100 years. The price is unattractive. Mike Smith is the only Councilor who passes this corner multiple times a day as we do. The rest of you including the City Manager live in safe havens of Quail Ridge, Hunter Woods, Lantern Ridge, Fox Run, Kehr Road and Southern Knolls. If you approve this bad choice you won't be affected. McCarthy's recently moved to Heritage Subdivision, all residential single-family. Webb's home is deeply setback from Contreras in the woods. Neither is impacted by a business open 12 hours a day or a dozen people living next to them. This doesn't pass the 'sniff test' for multiple decision standards. Any reuse of this property for a spot rezone adding more residents, more vehicles and business hours is unacceptable for this area and this building. It's a given anything other than single-family which has been there 100 years will generate more noise, negatively impact the neighborhood, the character of it, property values, on/off site parking and traffic. Our area does not deserve this. Spot rezoning is an irreversible mistake for this address. A potential domino effect setting negative precedent on zoning and damaging the stability of this residential area. Once the zoning is changed you know there is no turning back. You've learned that from Southpointe. I hope you have two weeks to think smartly on this.'

Mr. Snyder referred to page 75 of the agenda and inquired if the efficiency apartment was included in the maximum number of dwelling units and Mr. Keebler advised yes. Mr. Snyder inquired why it was stated there could be 3 apartments or 2 apartments. Mr. Keebler advised it was intended to give the owners flexibility to market or use the property and still limit the amount of potential occupants. Mr. Snyder inquired assuming the Preliminary Planned Development was adopted, what the timeframe was in which something had to happen. Mr. Chen advised the sunset clause for a Preliminary Planned Development was two years with a one year extension if approved by the Planning Commission. Mr. Snyder noted the owner could do nothing for two years and in the meantime sell the property and Mr. Chen concurred.

Ms. Southard asked Mr. Chen to explain to the public what rights they had with regard to light pollution and traffic from neighboring residences. Mr. Chen referred to Zoning Code Section 1141.04 (f) and advised there were regulations for light and glare from exterior lights. Ms. Southard inquired if those applied to any residence and Mr. Chen advised yes, within the City limits.

Mr. Keebler referred to page 75 of the agenda and clarified that the uses were limited to those specifically enumerated in Oxford Zoning Code Section 1159.17 which defined 'Professional Office'.

Mr. Keebler noted Ms. Zien was incorrect by stating barber and beauty shops, etc., would be permitted uses. Mr. Keebler advised Professional Office did not include everything permitted in the RO Districts. Mr. Keebler suggested amending condition 1) by inserting after three dwelling units *'the current efficiency apartment and two additional units'* and after two dwelling units *'the current efficiency apartment and one additional unit'*. Mr. Keebler advised the Preliminary Planned Development application passed by the Planning Commission by a 4-0-0 vote and that was not the case when previous requests came before the commission for rezoning. Mr. Keebler noted the Preliminary Planned Development was not spot rezoning - it was a legal use of a Planned Development within the existing zoning code. Mr. Keebler advised Mr. Prytherch spoke many times about having some mixed use in residential areas and this was a good chance to try that concept and it would help preserve a historic building which was not surrounded by single family homes. Mr. Keebler noted he felt the property was an anomaly and he did not see anyone investing in the property and maintaining it as a single family residence. Mr. Keebler advised before the McCarthy purchase, the house was getting in disrepair. Mr. Keebler noted the efficiency apartment had been there for decades and initially was the caretakers residence. Mr. Keebler advised the property was improperly rezoned R1 in 2004 making it nonconforming severely limiting what the owners could do. Mr. Keebler noted he felt Council needed to do something to make the property more viable and help assure the house was preserved and he felt the Planned Development would do that. Mr. Keebler advised in 2010 he voted against the request for RO zoning as it was spot zoning and he felt the allowable uses under RO were too broad. Mr. Keebler noted in 2015 he voted against the request for R3 zoning as there was nothing to keep the house from being torn down and an apartment building being built. Mr. Keebler advised Council could not rezone the property and put conditions on it but through a Planned Development they could.

Mr. Keebler moved to amend condition 1) to insert after three dwelling units *(the current efficiency apartment and two additional units)* and after two dwelling units *(the current efficiency apartment and one additional unit)*. Mr. Snyder seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Snyder inquired what restrictions were placed on the structure in terms of the historic plaque. Mr. Chen advised none, it only marked the historic significance of the building. Mr. Snyder inquired if a demolition permit could be granted if the Planned Development did not get adopted and Mr. Chen advised yes.

Ms. Southard inquired if there were other single family homes in Oxford with similar square footage. Mr. Chen advised the property in question was 5,000 square feet and new homes in Hunter Woods were 2,500 to 3,000 square feet. Mr. Chen noted the property in question was built in 1890 with the original footprint being 3,700 square feet. Mayor McKeehan inquired what size the homes in Stone Creek were and Mr. Chen advised 3,000 to 3,500 square feet.

ORDINANCE
2016 APPROPRIATIONS

An Ordinance To Make Appropriations For Current Expenses And Other Expenditures Of The City Of Oxford, State Of Ohio, During The Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Mr. Newlin noted this was the annual expenditure Ordinance as discussed at the October 8, 2015 City Council Work Session. Mr. Newlin referred to pages 107 and 108 of the agenda and discussed significant items within the proposed budget. Mr. Newlin offered to answer any questions.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public and there were none.

Mayor McKeehan advised items regarding the proposed budget were discussed at the Council Retreat, the CIP Work Session and the Budget Work Session.

ORDINANCE
BUDGETED TRANSFERS

An Ordinance Outlining Budgeted Transfers For The City Of Oxford, State Of Ohio, During The Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Mr. Newlin discussed his staff report as presented on pages 128-130 of the agenda and offered to answer any questions.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public or from Council and there were none.

ORDINANCE
BUDGETED ADVANCES

An Ordinance Outlining Budgeted Advances For The City Of Oxford, State Of Ohio, During The Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Mr. Newlin discussed his staff report as presented on page 133 of the agenda and offered to answer any questions.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public or from Council and there were none.

ORDINANCE
2016 FEES & CHARGES

An Ordinance Adopting Fees And Charges For Fiscal Year 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Mr. Newlin referred to pages 136-156 of the agenda and noted changes in the fee ordinance were in bold print. Mr. Newlin advised specific questions should be directed to the appropriate Department Head. Mr. Newlin noted fees for trash pick-up and fees for water and wastewater were reduced by 2%. Mr. Newlin advised the trash fee was based on the current overhead compared to the new overhead.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public and there were none.

Mr. Keebler referred to page 141 of the agenda and inquired if the $250 fee for Certificate of Use and Occupancy was a new fee. Mr. Chen advised yes, and noted Butler County and other municipalities charged this fee. Mr. Keebler advised he felt it should be part of the building permit fee.

ORDINANCES
SECOND READING

ORDINANCE
MUNICIPAL INCOME TAX

An Ordinance No. 3331 To Adopt Chapter 182 Of The Codified Ordinances Of The City Of Oxford Regarding Municipal Income Tax Effective January 1, 2016. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Mr. Newlin advised he had nothing new to add since the first reading of the proposed Ordinance and noted the Regional Income Tax Agency was waiting for Council to adopt it and have it ready for next year.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public and there were none.

Mr. Snyder noted, as was discussed at the last meeting, this was a new state law and Council was mandated to adopt the new legislation.

Mr. Elliott advised this was the enabling legislation that allowed the City to collect income tax.

Mr. Snyder moved to adopt Ordinance No. 3331. Mr. Smith seconded. The Ordinance was adopted by the following roll call:

AYE: Ms. Southard, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Keebler, Mr. Smith, Mr. Snyder, Mayor McKeehan (6)

NAY: None (0)

ABS: None (0)

ORDINANCE
SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

An Ordinance No. 3332 Amending Ordinance No. 3286. Supplemental Budget Ordinance Number 7 To Make Supplemental Appropriations For Fiscal Year 2015. (Joe Newlin, Finance Director)

Mr. Newlin advised he had nothing further to add since the first reading of the proposed Ordinance.

Mayor McKeehan inquired if there were any comments from the public or from Council and there were none.

Mr. Snyder moved to adopt Ordinance No. 3332. Mr. Blackburn seconded. The Ordinance was adopted by the following roll call:

AYE: Mr. Keebler, Mr. Smith, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Southard, Mr. Blackburn, Mayor McKeehan (6)

NAY: None (0)

ABS: None (0)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Elliott updated Council and the public on the US 27 South improvement project noting good progress was being made and the weather had cooperated this fall for the $11.1 million improvement.

Mr. Elliott congratulated Mr. Newlin and his staff for receiving the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting for fiscal year 2014. Mr. Elliott noted this was the 31st year the City of Oxford received this award.

Mr. Kyger noted a new restaurant at 12 West Park Place was opening soon and Tang Dynasty recently opened at 32 W. High Street. Mr. Kyger advised Kona Bistro recently changed hands and Tom and Amy Elliott would be very much missed. Mr. Kyger noted local residents Blake and Tyler Jennings bought the business and would continue to operate Kona Bistro.

Ms. Southard noted the Veterans Day ceremony would take place November 11th at noon in the Uptown Park and encouraged everyone to attend. Ms. Southard advised the 'Empty Bowls' event would take place November 14th at the Oxford Community Arts Center and all of the proceeds would go the Oxford Community Choice Pantry. Ms. Southard noted the pantry was always grateful for the event which raised a lot of money and brought the community together.

Mr. Blackburn advised a Craft Show and Bean Soup Luncheon would take place the morning of November 14th at the Senior Center. Mr. Blackburn advised both events on November 14th were good and good for the community.

Mayor McKeehan congratulated Mr. Newlin, Ms. Hill and the Finance Department staff on their CAFR award noting he was proud to have them serve the community. Mayor McKeehan noted his hope everyone voted today. Mayor McKeehan encouraged everyone to attend the Veterans Day ceremony on November 11th.

ADJOURN

Mr. Snyder moved to adjourn at 9:20 p.m. Ms. Southard seconded. The motion passed 6-0-0.

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Council Meeting of: November 17, 2015 — Service Department **Originating Department**

Account Code #: N/A — David Treleaven **Prepared By**

Budgeted Amount: N/A — November 5, 2015 **Date Prepared**

Agenda Title:	Environmental Commission Meeting of November 4, 2015

Recommendation:	For Review and Consideration

Discussion:

Environmental Commission members present at the Wednesday, November 4, 2015 meeting were: Chair, Mr. Wright Gwyn; Vice-Chair, Mr. Vince Hand, and Mr. Robert Bell. A quorum was not present. City Council Representative, Ms. Kate Rousmaniere and Mr. Ted Wong had previously informed the Commission that they would be unable to attend the November 4th Commission meeting.

No action was taken regarding the minutes from the October 7, 2015 Environmental Commission meeting as a quorum was not present.

Mr. Bell was absent from the most recent Planning Commission meeting, so no update on their recent activity was given.

Mr. Hand provided Staff with information from the Miami University's Environmental Protocol course (IES 411/511) project regarding inspection and inventory of over 150 storm sewer outfalls. This project was intended to assist in the illicit discharge detection and elimination requirement of the Phase II National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Management Program mandated by the USEPA Clean Water Act.

The status of Commissioner's research into sensitive development areas, planned developments, and major site development plans were reviewed. Information pertaining to existing Codes and Ordinances from other municipalities regarding major site developments appeared to be difficult to locate, and what information was found was considered to be vague and generalized at best.

The Commissioners concluded discussion at 7:50 p.m. The next scheduled meeting of the Environmental Commission is on Wednesday, December 2, 2015 at 7:00 p.m., in the Municipal Building's Second Floor Conference Room.

Approved By:		Initial	Date
	Department Head:	MBD	11/6/15
	City Manager:	DRE	11/13/15

STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Clerk of Council

Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: November 17, 2015

Mary Ann Eaton

Prepared By

Account Code No. #: N/A

Budgeted Amount: N/A

November 10, 2015

Date Prepared

Agenda Title: Resolution amending Resolution No.4943 declaring certain City property no longer needed for municipal purposes as surplus and authorizing the sale of said items to the highest bidder utilizing GovDeals, Inc. **The proceeds thereof shall be deposited in the Fire/EMS Fund.**

Recommendation: N/A

Discussion:

Resolution No. 4943 adopted by City Council on November 3, 2015 stated in Section 3 "the City Manager or his designee is hereby authorized to dispose of said property through GovDeals, Inc. and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited in the General Fund". The proceeds should be deposited in the **Fire/EMS Fund.**

Approved By:

	Initial	Date
Department Head:		
City Manager:	DRE	11/13/15

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 4943 DECLARING CERTAIN CITY PROPERTY NO LONGER NEEDED FOR MUNICIPAL PURPOSES AS SURPLUS AND AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF SAID ITEMS TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER UTILIZING GOVDEALS, INC. **THE PROCEEDS THEREOF SHALL BE DEPOSITED IN THE FIRE/EMS FUND.**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The City Manager and the Fire Chief report that the items set forth on Exhibit "A" attached hereto belonging to the City can no longer be used for municipal purposes and should be declared surplus.

SECTION 2: The City Manager and the Fire Chief recommend that the items set forth on Exhibit "A" attached hereto be disposed of by sale to the highest bidder utilizing GovDeals, Inc.

SECTION 3: Council hereby finds and determines that the items set forth on Exhibit "A" attached hereto can no longer be used for municipal purposes and are hereby declared to be surplus. Accordingly, the City Manager or his designee is hereby authorized to dispose of said property through GovDeals, Inc. and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited in the ~~General Fund~~ **Fire/EMS Fund**.

SECTION 4: This resolution shall take effect at the earliest date allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)

RESOLUTION NO. 4943

A RESOLUTION DECLARING CERTAIN CITY PROPERTY NO LONGER NEEDED FOR MUNICIPAL PURPOSES AS SURPLUS AND AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF SAID ITEMS TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER UTILIZING GOVDEALS, INC.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The City Manager and the Fire Chief report that the items set forth on Exhibit "A" attached hereto belonging to the City can no longer be used for municipal purposes and should be declared surplus.

SECTION 2: The City Manager and the Fire Chief recommend that the items set forth on Exhibit "A" attached hereto be disposed of by sale to the highest bidder utilizing GovDeals, Inc.

SECTION 3: Council hereby finds and determines that the items set forth on Exhibit "A" attached hereto can no longer be used for municipal purposes and are hereby declared to be surplus. Accordingly, the City Manager or his designee is hereby authorized to dispose of said property through GovDeals, Inc. and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited in the General Fund.

SECTION 4: This resolution shall take effect at the earliest date allowed by law.

MAYOR

ADOPTED: November 3, 2015

ATTEST: MaryAnn Eaton
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)

EXHIBIT "A"

1999 Ford Crown Victoria (1FDKE30FOTHA71913)

1996 Ford ambulance (2FAFP71W9XX214469)

(2) Ferno 93-P Pro Flex Cots

(1) Lot of miscellaneous obsolete pagers and radio equipment

(1) Lot of obsolete laptop computers and mounting brackets

(1) Glass display case

(3) Desks

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Finance
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: 11/17/15

Account Code No. _____

Joe Newlin
Prepared By

Budgeted Amount: _____

11/12/2015
Date Prepared

Agenda Title: **Resolution for advanced property tax payment from Butler County**

Recommendation: **Approve**

Discussion:

This resolution is to request that Butler County remit 2016 property taxes which they have already received to the City earlier than their standard pay date in March. The early payment request can accelerate the receiving of a portion of the taxes by a month or more. To qualify for the early advance, the County requires the passage of a resolution each year.

Approved By:

	Initial	Date
Department Head:		11/12/15
City Manager:	DRE	11/13/15

RESOLUTION NO._____

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO REQUEST ADVANCED PAYMENT OF PROPERTY TAXES TO THE CITY IN 2016 FROM BUTLER COUNTY.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The City Manager and Finance Director recommend that the City Manager be authorized to request advanced payment of property taxes, as much as available as soon as possible, from Butler County in order to maximize cash flow to meet the demands of financing operations and capital expenditures.

SECTION 2: Council hereby finds that it is in the best interest of the City of Oxford to request payment of property taxes that Butler County has collected in advance of the normal payment date.

SECTION 3: Council further determines that the early receipt of said property taxes will result in additional interest income for the City.

SECTION 4: Council hereby accepts the recommendation of the City Manager and Finance Director and hereby authorizes the City Manager to submit a request to Butler County for the advanced payment of property taxes, as much as available as soon as possible.

SECTION 5: This resolution shall take effect at the earliest date allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED:_____

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

City Manager
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: November 17, 2015

Doug Elliott
Prepared By

Account Code No. #: N/A

Budgeted Amount: N/A

November 6, 2015
Date Prepared

Agenda Title: A Resolution adopting the Amendment to the Government Aggregation Master Retail Supply Agreement between the City of Oxford and AEP Energy, Inc.

Recommendation: Adopt the Resolution

Discussion:
I am recommending City Council adopt by resolution this Amendment to the Government Aggregation Master Retail Supply Agreement. Under the Amended Agreement, subsequent opt-out letters would be mailed to addresses where the customer was included in the City's Electric Aggregation Program but moved out at a later date (primarily student housing) and the account returned to the Duke standard service rate. It would not be mailed to residents who are already in the program or who opted-out.

In April, the City had an enrollment in our program of 4,488 accounts (97.7% of total eligible accounts). The number declined to 2,325 accounts in August of 2015. By providing subsequent opt-out letters throughout the remaining term of the agreement, it will make it more convenient for students to participate in the City's Electric Aggregation Program.

Approved By:

	Initial	Date
Department Head:		
City Manager:	DRE	11/13/15

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL ADOPTING THE AMENDMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT AGGREGATION MASTER RETAIL SUPPLY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF OXFORD AND AEP ENERGY, INC. WHICH PERMITS AEP ENERGY, INC. TO CONDUCT SUBSEQUENT OPT-OUTS AT VARIOUS TIMES THROUGHOUT THE REMAINING TERM OF THE AGREEMENT (REFRESH OPT-OUTS).

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION I: City Council hereby finds that it is in the public's best interest to adopt the Amendment to the Government Aggregation Master Retail Supply Agreement between the City of Oxford and AEP Energy, Inc. which permits AEP Energy, Inc. to conduct subsequent opt-outs at various times throughout the remaining term of the agreement (refresh out-outs).

SECTION II: City Council hereby adopts the Amendment to the Government Aggregation Master Retail Supply Agreement between the City of Oxford and AEP Energy, Inc. a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" which permits AEP Energy, Inc. to conduct subsequent opt-outs at various times throughout the remaining term of the agreement (refresh opt-outs).

SECTION III: This resolution shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____

MAYOR

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:

_____

CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)

EXHIBIT 'A'

AMENDMENT
TO
GOVERNMENT AGGREGATION MASTER RETAIL SUPPLY AGREEMENT

This Amendment to Government Aggregation Master Retail Supply Agreement (this "Amendment") is made and effective this October 9, 2015, by and between AEP Energy, Inc. ("AEP Energy") and The City of Oxford, Ohio ("Government Aggregator") and amends the Government Aggregation Master Retail Supply Agreement by and between AEP Energy and Government Aggregator dated March 13, 2015, including any exhibits, attachments and tables thereto and amendments thereof (the "Agreement"). Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Amendment shall have the meaning ascribed to such terms in the Agreement. AEP Energy and Government Aggregator shall hereinafter be individually referred to as "Party" and jointly referred to as "Parties," as applicable.

WHEREAS, AEP Energy and Government Aggregator are parties to the Agreement;

WHEREAS, Government Aggregator wishes to permit AEP Energy to conduct subsequent Program opt-outs ("Refresh Opt Outs") at various times throughout the remaining term of the Agreement, in accordance with the Parties' obligations, representations and warranties contained in the Agreement, Government Aggregator's Plan, and all applicable federal, state and local laws, rules, regulations and tariffs and PUCO rules and orders; and

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to amend the Agreement to include Refresh Opt Outs in the Agreement as of the date hereof.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises, conditions and covenants contained in the Agreement, including this Amendment thereto, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Parties agree as follows:

1. The Agreement is hereby amended by adding the following paragraphs to the end of Section 1.2:

> Following the initial opt-out process conducted by AEP Energy, AEP Energy may determine to conduct subsequent opt-outs at various times throughout the remaining term of this Agreement ("Refresh Opt Outs") and, if so determined, shall conduct each Refresh Opt Out upon concurrence with the Government Aggregator. If conducted, such Refresh Opt Out(s) shall provide to newly eligible customers the opportunity to participate in the Program. All Refresh Opt Outs shall be conducted in the same manner as the initial opt out.
>
> Any eligible residential or non-mercantile commercial customer that is located within the EDU's service territory and the Government Aggregator's jurisdictional territory at the time of any Refresh Opt Out (including, without limitation, any eligible customer who opens a new account or who was formerly a member of the Program that moves to a new location, each within the EDU's service territory and Government Aggregator's jurisdictional territory, a "Newly Eligible Customer") will be included in such Refresh Opt Out; provided, however, that no Refresh Opt Out notifications shall be sent to current Customers already participating in the Program or eligible residential or non-mercantile commercial customers that have previously (at such customer's same service address or account) opted out of, or rescinded under, the Program. As related to any Newly Eligible Customer, the price and term end date, which shall be the same as the initial opt out (subject to any amendments or revisions otherwise permitted under this Agreement), as well as other terms and conditions, which shall be substantially similar to the initial opt out or any other Refresh Opt Out, shall continue for the remainder of the term of this Agreement.
>
> Should this Agreement be renewed for subsequent periods, to the extent required by applicable law or government rule, or regulation any person enrolled in the Program shall have the

opportunity to opt out of the Program, without paying a switching fee. The notice/disclosure required above shall also include a stated procedure for such opportunity to opt out of the Program.

2. To the extent that any of the terms and conditions in this Amendment conflict with any prior amendment to the Agreement, the terms and conditions of this Amendment shall control and take precedence. Except as set forth above, all other terms and conditions of the Agreement shall remain, and be, in full force and effect without change. No amendment, modification or waiver in respect of this Amendment will be effective unless in writing and executed by each of the Parties. This Amendment may be executed and delivered in one or more counterparts, each of which will be deemed an original, but all of which shall together constitute one instrument. Any counterpart may be executed and evidenced by signature transmitted by facsimile, email or other electronic means as though it were an original. The individuals signing this Amendment represent and warrant that they are authorized or empowered to enter into this Amendment on behalf of their respective Party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Amendment has been duly executed by the Parties as of the date first set forth above.

The City of Oxford, Ohio	**AEP Energy, Inc.**
_____	_____
Name:	Name:
Title:	Title:

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Community Development
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: November 17, 2015

Jung-Han Chen
Prepared By

Account Code No. #:

Budgeted Amount: N/A

November 10, 2015
Date Prepared

Agenda Title:	**Resolution for a temporary abatement of the noise ordinance No. 2500, Section 509.09 on Thursday, April 14, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. on Friday, April 15, 2016 in and around Millet Hall on Miami University's campus.**

Recommendation:	Approval

The applicant is working with MU Facility and Campus to host a Drum Line Competition to be held on April 14 and 15, 2016. The application is in conjunction with the Arts Work Championships competition that will take place in several local university campuses, including Miami University.

This application has gone before the Student Community Relations Commission and it was recommended by the Commission that Council approve the abatement of noise during that time period.

Approved By:	**Initial**	**Date**
Department Head:	\	
City Attorney:	\	
City Manager:	DRE \	11/13/15

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A TEMPORARY ABATEMENT OF THE NOISE ORDINANCE NO. 2550, SECTION 509.09, ON THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2016 FROM 8:00 A.M. UNTIL 10:00 P.M. ON FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2016 AT MILLETT HALL ON MIAMI UNIVERSITY'S CAMPUS FOR THE WGI SPORT OF THE ARTS DRUM LINE COMPETITION..

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The City Manager and the Police Chief recommend a temporary abatement of the Noise Ordinance No. 2550, Section 509.09, for the WGI Sport of the Arts Drum Line Competition on Thursday, April 14, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. on Friday, April 15, 2016 at Millett Hall on Miami University's campus in accordance with the provisions in the Noise Ordinance No. 2550, Section 509.11, Exceptions to Noise Restrictions, Section G: "Noises resulting from authorized public activities such as parades, fireworks, sports events, musical productions and other activities which have the approval of the City of Oxford, Ohio."

SECTION 2: Council having reviewed the recommendation and finding this to be a public activity hereby authorizes the City Manager to issue a temporary abatement of the Noise Ordinance.

SECTION 3: The City Manager is hereby authorized to approve a temporary abatement of the Noise Ordinance No. 2550 Section 509.09 for the WGI Sport of the Arts Drum Line Competition on Thursday, April 14, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. on Friday, April 15, 2016 at Millett Hall on Miami University's campus.

SECTION 4: This resolution shall take effect at the earliest date allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)

CITY OF OXFORD
NOISE ABATEMENT APPLICATION

EVENT INFORMATION:

DATE REQUESTED FOR NOISE ABATEMENT: **April 14-15, 2016**

FROM: **8:00 AM** a.m. / p.m. TO: **10:00 PM** a.m. / p.m.

ACTIVITY/EVENT TO BE UNDERTAKEN:

Drum Line Competition

LOCATION (attach copies of paperwork showing approval to use site):

Millett Hall at Miami University

NUMBER OF PEOPLE EXPECTED TO ATTEND: **1,000**

OPEN TO PUBLIC	(YES)	NO
ALCOHOL AVAILABLE	YES	(NO)

TYPE OF SOUND EQUIPMENT TO BE USED:

None

SOUND MONITORING PLANS (including person in charge of this process):

All sound monitoring will be done by Department of Intercollegiate Athletics & University Police

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION INFORMATION:

NAME OF ORGANIZATION: **WGI Sport of the Arts**

ADDRESS: **2405 Cross Pointe Drive, Dayton, OH 45342** TEL. #: **937-247-5919**

What is the contact person's relation to the organization (title, etc.)?

Ron Nankervis, Executive Director

ATTACH EXTRA PAGES IF THE SPACE PROVIDED ABOVE IS INSUFFICIENT AND ATTACH ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTATION THAT MAY BE OF RELEVANCE.

I have read and understand the rules, conditions and laws applicable to the waiver of the noise ordinances, and understand that acceptance of them is a condition of approval. I hereby certify that the event/activity, which is the subject of this application will be open to the public and alcohol free.

Applicant's signature Date: **September 21, 2015**

WGI Sport of the Arts is the world's premier organization producing indoor color guard, percussion, and wind ensemble competitions. As a non-profit youth organization, WGI serves as the leading governing body of the winter guard and indoor percussion activities. It is called the Sport of the Arts because it brings music to life through performance in a competitive format. Now entering its 39th year in 2016, the sport continues to evolve and grow. There were more than 36,000 participants at the regional level, and more than 12,000 participants at the Sport of the Arts World Championships this past April.

- An estimated 40,000 visitors will generate about $15 million in economic benefits for the Miami Valley this week and next as part of the 38th annual Winter Guard International World Championships.
- University of Dayton Arena, Wright State University's Nutter Center, Millett Hall at Miami University, Cintas Arena at Xavier University and the Dayton Convention Center will serve as competition venues.
- The 2016 World Championships mark the 30th year of the 39 years of competition that the event has been hosted in Dayton.

Every year, drumlines, wind ensembles and color guards — or winter guards — from South Africa to the Netherlands fill Dayton's hotels, restaurants and shopping malls.

According to Jacquelyn Powell, CEO of the Dayton Convention & Visitor's Bureau, the event is significant for the area. "It is our largest event in terms of sheer numbers," Powell said. "Other events, like the NCAA First Four, give Dayton greater media attention and national recognition, but, in terms of numbers, this is at the top."

WGI's Purpose
WGI Sport of the Arts provides a venue for young people to achieve the extraordinary through performance and competition.

WGI's Mission
WGI Sport of the Arts:
-organizes high-energy and enjoyable color guard and percussion events.
-provides leadership through education to constantly improve the quality of ensembles
-develops our judging systems and adjudicators to ensure fair competition
-partners with corporations, educators and others to increase awareness and recognition

WGI's Values
WGI Sport of the Arts:
-exists for the participants, their leaders and supporters
-inspires our participants to achieve the highest artistic and creative standards
-views competition as a means to encourage the highest standard of excellence
-treats every participant as a unique individual with inherent dignity regardless of race, gender, creed, sexual orientation, origin or cultural background.
-believes that every program and style starts with an equal opportunity for success

Competition
WGI uses a competition-based approach for organizing events in order to showcase youth activities in pursuit of high standards of achievement. Events include about 42 Regionals and Elite Events, which lead to the three-day World Championships that evaluate more than 300 guards and 200 percussion ensembles from over 40 states and six countries.

Indoor Percussion
An **indoor percussion ensemble** or **indoor drumline** consists of the marching percussion (also called battery) and front ensemble (also called pit) sections of a marching band or drum corps. Indoor percussion marries elements of music performance, marching, and theater; thus, the activity is often referred to as percussion theater. Although most indoor percussion ensembles are affiliated with high schools, there are also many independent groups that draw participants from a large area.

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager:	**Douglas Elliott**	**Police** Originating Department
Council Meeting Of:		
		Robert.B. Holzworth
Account Code No. #:	**N/A**	Prepared By
Budgeted Amount:	**N/A**	**November 12, 2015** Date Prepared

Agenda Title: A resolution to provide free 2-hr parking at meters on the southern section of Lot 52; on East and West Park Place; on High Street between Campus Avenue and College Avenue; and on Poplar, Main and Beech Streets between Church and Walnut Streets during the 2015 Christmas/2016 New Year's Day holiday season.

Recommendation: Approve

Discussion:

The Parking Unit recommends that **FREE** 2-hour holiday parking be provided at the meters High Street between Campus and College Avenues; on East and West Park Place; on Poplar Street, Main Street and Beech Street (between Walnut and Church Streets); and the southern section of Lot 52, starting on Monday, December 14, 2015, at 9:00 a.m. and ending on Thursday, December 31, 2015, at 6:00 p.m. Normal operations will resume on Saturday, January 2, 2016. (NOTE: Friday, 01 January 2016, is New Year's Day, a national holiday, and meter fees are not required.)

The meters will be bagged with red plastic covers that read as follows: "Happy Holidays, FREE PARKING (2 HOUR LIMIT)." This has been very well received by merchants and shoppers in the past and will likely continue to be an incentive for residents and visitors to visit the Uptown district to shop and/or dine.

Approved By:		**Initial Date**
	Department Head:	_____ \ _____
	City Manager:	DRE \ 11/13/15

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO WAIVE PARKING METER FEES ON HIGH STREET, EAST PARK PLACE, WEST PARK PLACE, POPLAR STREET, MAIN STREET AND BEECH STREET BETWEEN WALNUT STREET AND CHURCH STREET, AND IN THE SOUTHERN (2-HR) SECTION OF LOT 52 FROM 9:00 A.M. ON DECEMBER 14, 2015 UNTIL 6:00 P.M. ON DECEMBER 31, 2015. THE TWO HOUR RESTRICTION FOR METERS IN THESE LOCATIONS WILL REMAIN IN EFFECT.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The City Manager recommends approval of the proposal of the Police Chief to waive parking meter fees on High Street, East Park Place, West Park Place, Poplar Street, Main Street and Beech Street between Walnut Street and Church Street, and in the southern (2-hr) section of Lot 52 from 9:00 a.m. on December 14, 2015, until 6:00 p.m. on December 31, 2015. The two hour restriction for meters in these locations will remain in effect.

SECTION 2: City Council hereby accepts the recommendation of the City Manager and the Police Chief and authorizes the City Manager to waive parking meter fees on High Street, East Park Place, West Park Place, Poplar Street, Main Street and Beech Street between Walnut Street and Church Street, and in the southern (2-hr) section Lot 52 from 9:00 a.m. on December 14, 2015 until 6:00 p.m. on December 31, 2015. The two hour restriction for meters in these locations will remain in effect.

SECTION 3: This resolution shall take effect at the earliest date allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Council Meeting Of: November 17, 2015

Account Code No. #: N/A

Budgeted Amount: N/A

City Manager
Originating Department

Doug Elliott
Prepared By

November 12, 2015
Date Prepared

Agenda Title: An Ordinance Repealing Oxford Codified Ordinance Section 141.04 Entitled Police Advisory Board, And Adopting New Oxford Codified Ordinance Section 141.04 Entitled Police Community Relations And Review Commission.

Discussion

In 2005 the City Council of the City of Oxford passed an ordinance to re-establish a separate Police Advisory Board (PAB). The PAB consisted of 14 Oxford residents. The purpose of the PAB was to advise the Chief of Police and the Police Division about matters relating to community policing and such other questions as may seem pertinent. For a number of reasons, the PAB quit meeting regularly several years ago and members were no longer appointed to the PAB by Council.

In October of 2013, the Community Relations Commission (CRC) was cc on a letter from the Oxford Unit of the NAACP requesting to meet with representatives of the Police Division to discuss the training of police officers relating to diversity and multicultural sensitivity, as well as disciplinary actions, taken for inappropriate behavior in those areas. Over the next six meetings of the CRC, the members continued to discuss police diversity and multicultural sensitivity training plus ways to support citizens who may have concerns about interactions with the police. One idea was to expand the role of the CRC to handle citizen complaints of alleged police misconduct. At the September 25, 2014 meeting of the CRC, the benefits of establishing a separate oversight or review board instead of expanding the role of the CRC was discussed. The CRC members and the City Manager favored this approach. In December 2014, the City Manager provided a rough draft of a proposed police oversight or review ordinance to the CRC members. When the CRC met in December 2014, the City Manager's proposed draft was rejected because it did not seem to fit our needs. Police review models from other communities were discussed over the next three CRC meetings. This past July, Pat Meade provided a proposed police oversight ordinance. Over the last four months this proposed ordinance has been discussed at CRC meetings and with members of the Oxford Police Division. It has undergone several changes and modifications since then.

On the agenda is a proposed ordinance to establish a Police Community Relations and Review Commission (PCRRC). The purpose of this commission is to improve communication between the City of Oxford Police Division and the community, increasing police accountability and credibility with the public, and to create a fair and impartial complaint process.

The Commission shall consist of seven members appointed by City Council and reflective of our community's diversity. As required by the City Charter, the City Manager or designee shall be an ex officio member without a vote. The Commission shall meet at least quarterly.

I believe this proposed commission will serve to increase the community's understanding of police work, enhancing citizen understanding of the process for handling complaints against police officers, increasing trust and confidence of the Oxford police division (OPD) especially with the minority community, and ensuring greater accountability by the OPD.

Approved By:		
		Initial Date
	Department Head:	
	City Manager:	DRC 11/13/15

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE REPEALING OXFORD CODIFIED ORDINANCE SECTION 141.04 ENTITLED POLICE ADVISORY BOARD, AND ADOPTING NEW OXFORD CODIFIED ORDINANCE SECTION 141.04 ENTITLED POLICE COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND REVIEW COMMISSION.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: Council hereby finds that it is in the best interest of the citizens of Oxford, Ohio, to repeal Oxford Codified Ordinance Section 141.04 entitled Police Advisory Board, and adopt new Oxford Codified Ordinance Section 141.04 entitled Police Community Relations and Review Commission.

SECTION 2: Council hereby repeals Section 141.04 of the Oxford Code of Ordinances and adopts new Section 141.04 as follows:

141.04 Police Community Relations and Review Commission (PCRRC)

141.041 Establishment, Purpose, Membership, and Terms

(a) The purpose of the PCRRC (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), is to improve communication between the City of Oxford Police Division and the community, increase police accountability and credibility with the public, and to create a fair and impartial complaint process. The objectives of the Commission are to advise the Chief of Police, the City Manager, the Civil Service Commission, and the City Council about matters relating to the policies and procedures of the Oxford Police Division (hereinafter referred to as "OPD"), the training of law enforcement personnel, hiring procedures, and such other questions as may seem pertinent to the safety and protection of the citizenry. The Commission will take citizens' complaints about officer misconduct and review any investigation of misconduct, thereby increasing police accountability to the community and community trust in the OPD. The Commission may make recommendations concerning police policies, procedures, hiring, training, and the complaint process.

(b) The Commission shall consist of seven (7) members appointed by the City Council. All members shall be residents of the City of Oxford and be at least 18 years old at the time of appointment. Council shall endeavor to reflect community diversity in its appointments. Four members will initially be appointed to serve three-year terms and three members will initially be appointed to two-year terms. Thereafter, the Commission members shall be appointed to three-year terms. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

(c) Members are encouraged to attend the Oxford Citizens Police Academy, at least one weekend late evening "ride along" with the OPD, or other training activities and events sponsored by the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement.

(d) City of Oxford employees shall not be eligible to be members of the Commission with the exception of the City Manager or designee who shall be an ex-officio member without a vote.

141.042 Officers, Meetings, Quorum, Rules

(a) The Commission shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair from among its members to serve two year terms. The Chair shall conduct the meetings and the Vice-Chair shall do so in the Chair's absence. The Commission shall also elect a secretary from among its members to serve a two year term and whose responsibility will be to take minutes at each meeting of the Commission.

(b) Four (4) members shall constitute a quorum for conducting business. All recommendations and decisions of the Commission shall require the affirmative vote of four (4) members of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall meet at least quarterly. The Chair or four (4) members of the Commission may on seventy-two (72) hour public notice call a special meeting of the Commission. Complaints will be audited; and police policies and procedures, including training and hiring, will be reviewed at the meetings. Opportunities for public comment will be made available at all meetings.

(d) At least one meeting during the year will be with the Chief of Police or a representative for a report by the OPD on data requested by the Commission.

(e) At least one meeting during the year will be designated for community outreach, for reporting to the public and keeping stakeholders informed of the Commission's work, including its recommendations regarding police policies, hiring, training, and the complaint process.

141.043 Duties

(a) The Commission may receive written citizens' complaints of law enforcement misconduct; audit the police investigation of the complaints; and make recommendations following the outcome of the investigations.

(b) The Commission shall review the investigation of any case of serious injury or death of a person arising out of or in connection with actions of peace officers employed by the OPD, regardless of whether a citizen complaint has been filed with the Commission.

(c) Upon review of operational procedures and policy implementation, the Commission may make recommendations to the Chief of Police, the City Manager, the Civil Service Commission and the City Council related to policies and procedures of the Police Department, the training of law enforcement personnel, hiring procedures, the complaint and investigative process, and such other matters as may seem pertinent to the safety and protection of the citizenry.

(d) The Commission shall host a yearly community meeting for open discussion and input from Oxford citizens and police officers.

(e) The Commission shall prepare and present a yearly report to the citizens and the City Council that analyzes data on citizen complaints, complaint disposition, investigative findings, and disciplinary actions taken by OPD. The report shall set forth any recommendations made on police policies, procedures, training, hiring, and the complaint and investigation process. The report should also summarize the yearly community meeting, designated for citizen input.

141.044 Complaint Procedure

(a) Written complaints may be filed with the Police Department, the City Clerk, or directly to the Commission by the following:

(1) Any person who is an alleged victim of misconduct by a police officer; or
(2) Any family member, friend, or attorney of an alleged victim of misconduct by a police officer; or
(3) Any person who witnessed alleged misconduct by a police officer

(b) Complaints must be filed within one (1) year from the alleged police officer misconduct.

(c) Complaints shall be forwarded to the Police Chief for internal investigation.

(d) The Chief of Police or designee shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the complaint process and investigation of any City of Oxford officer. The investigation shall follow those procedures set forth in the Employee Manual and Collective Bargaining Agreement.

(e) The Chief of Police shall give as may be permitted by law prompt written notice of the results of an investigation, including any disciplinary action for a sustained complaint, to the police officer(s), the complainant(s), and the Commission.

(f) Any party involved in a complaint investigation may request a meeting with the Commission to review and discuss the findings of the investigation. The request for a meeting shall be filed in writing within thirty (30) days of the notification and submitted to the City Clerk.

(g) The City Clerk shall promptly notify the Chief of Police and the members of the Commission when a decision has been appealed. The Chief of Police shall promptly forward to each Commission member a copy of all records pertaining to the complaint and the investigation of the complaint. The requirement that the Chief of Police promptly forward to the Commission a copy of all records pertaining to the complaint shall only require the release of those records deemed to be public records. Further, to the extent any officer appeals a disciplinary decision of the Chief of Police the release of records shall be subject to the officer's appeal.

(h) Retaliation is strictly prohibited. Any retaliatory action or conduct by any person against a person who has filed a complaint, was named in a complaint, served as a witness, assisted, or participated in an investigation or in any other manner has facilitated the duties of the Commission is prohibited.

This protection against retaliation extends to any person who files a complaint, is the subject of a complaint, provides information regarding a complaint, participates in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing related to a complaint resolution.

141.045 Commission Review and Recommendation

(a) If a meeting is requested with the Commission, a review of all the complaint and investigative materials shall take place at the next Commission meeting subject to those restrictions in Section 141.044. Witnesses may be called before the Commission if it is deemed necessary to give testimony. The Chief of Police or designee and any witness may present documentary evidence, and execute documents to the Commission for its review.

(b) The Commission shall present any recommendations to the City Manager, the Chief of Police, and all involved parties.

(1) The Commission may recommend general reforms or specific actions directed at individual police officers.

(2) Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the rights and full authority of the City Manager or Chief of Police to set disciplinary policies and take other lawful actions they deem appropriate for the Police Division, including the right to give notice and a hearing when disciplinary action is being considered, in accordance with any other Ordinance of the City or a labor contract.

(d) Upon completion of the review the Commission shall publicly announce in writing its recommendations unless it finds a compelling reason to impose confidentiality consistent with the law.

(e) The City Manager and Chief of Police may accept or reject the recommendations of the Commission and shall notify the complainant and the Commission in writing of their decision.

141.046 Definitions

(a) **Complaint**. A written and sworn statement concerning police conduct which is submitted to the Commission, City Clerk, City Manager or filed directly with the City of Oxford Police Division.

SECTION 3: This Ordinance shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____

MAYOR

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:

_____

CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: EDNA SOUTHARD

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Community Development
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: November 3, 2015

Account Code No. #:

Sam Perry
Prepared By:

Budgeted Amount:

October 28, 2015
Date Prepared:

PC-2015-22 CONDITIONAL USE, 10 University Avenue, to allow for shared use parking**, Paul Brokamp, Applicant/Agent**

Recommendation by the Planning Commission: Approval with Conditions

Discussion:

The applicant is seeking approval for a conditional use for shared and off-site parking between two adjacent buildings. The request came about as part of a building permit application for a rear addition to the existing home at 10 University Avenue. Adjacent properties are owned by Beta Theta Pi except for one Miami University parcel to the south. The garage being used for 10 University Avenue is not on the same lot as the home. It is on the lot of the home to the north, also owned by Beta. The Oxford Zoning Code requires parking and site access conditions be brought into compliance as part of an addition to a structure. Currently the parking/storage of vehicles is not on the same lot as the house. Therefore the shared parking across the lot line would have to be eliminated, variances be sought, or a conditional use be reviewed and approved. The applicant chose to seek the conditional use process which starts with the Planning Commission.

After discussion the Commission found that the application met both the general and specific Conditional Use Standards (1147.02 and 1147.03). Additionally, three non-conforming conditions would be eliminated because of the lot consolidation. The Commission recommended that the code requirement for the recorded easement agreement not be waived for this case. Therefore the Commission voted 5-0-0 to recommend approval of the shared parking conditional use with the following two conditions:

- That the five lots for 10 University be consolidated into one and the sixth remain separate; and
- That a Recorded Easement will be established to formalize the off-site parking.

Approved By:

Department Head: JHC 10/28/15
City Attorney:
City Manager: 10/30/15

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR SHARED-USE PARKING BETWEEN TWO ADJACENT LOTS AT 10 UNIVERSITY AVENUE OXFORD, OHIO 45056 WITH CONDITIONS.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: Council hereby finds that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 13, 2015 in accordance with Section 1147.02 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Oxford, on the application of Paul Brokamp, Architect, VSWC Architects, for a conditional use permit to allow for shared-use parking between two adjacent lots at 10 University Avenue Oxford, Ohio 45056.

SECTION 2: The Planning Commission, after a public hearing and discussion, voted to approve a motion recommending approval of the conditional use permit application to allow for shared-use parking between two adjacent lots at 10 University Avenue Oxford, Ohio with the following conditions:

1. Five lots for 10 University Avenue shall be consolidated into one and the sixth lot shall remain separate.
2. A recorded easement shall be established to formalize the off-site parking.

SECTION 3: Council hereby accepts the recommendation of the Planning Commission and accepts the recommendation report submitted by the Planning Commission and incorporates the same herein and further grants the conditional use permit application to allow for shared-use parking between two adjacent lots at 10 University Avenue Oxford, Ohio 45056 in accordance with the conditions set forth above.

SECTION 4: This Ordinance shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED:
ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW(STAFF)

Certification of Action
Oxford Planning Commission
Recommendation to City Council

Report Date	November 3, 2015
Case Number	PC-2015-22
Applicant Information	Paul Brokamp, VSWC Architects Beta Theta Pi
Requested Action	Conditional Use
Summary of Request	To allow for the continuance of shared use parking located at 10 University Avenue, Oxford, Ohio
Public Hearing Information	A Public Hearing took place at 118 W. High Street on October 13, 2015. A Public Hearing notice was published in the Journal News on September 13, 2015 and courtesy notices were mailed to adjacent property owners on September 11, 2015. Signage was posted at the site on October 6, 2015.
Commission Action	The Planning Commission voted 5-0-0 recommending approval with two conditions of the Conditional Use.
Commission Findings and Conclusions	Staff informed the Commission that the application came about as part of a building permit application for a rear addition to the existing home at 10 University Avenue. During the review it was realized that the garage being used for 10 University Avenue was not on the same lot as the home. The Oxford Zoning Code requires parking and site access conditions be brought into compliance as part of an addition to a structure. In all there are six lots involved, five for 10 University and one for the adjacent house with garage. After review the Planning Commission approved the request with two conditions: That, the five lots for 10 University be consolidated into one and the sixth lot shall remain separate; and That, a Recorded Easement will be established to formalize the off-site parking.
Exhibits Submitted to the Commission	1. Staff Report Dated October 7, 2015 2. Interoffice Review Transmittal Sheets 3. Property Notification Map 4. Letter of Agency 5. Conditional Use Permit Application August 28, 2015 6. Supporting Documents from Applicant

City of Oxford
Community Development Department
STAFF REPORT
Planning Commission

Case # PC-2015-22 **Date – October 13, 2015**

APPLICATION

Applicant:	Paul Brokamp, Architect, VSWC Architects
Location:	10 University Ave
Owner:	Beta Theta Pi
Action Request:	Conditional Use Permit Application for shared use parking
Current Use:	Single-family residence
Zoning:	R2MS (Single, Two-Family Mile Square Residential) District
Surrounding Existing Land Uses:	Single and Two-Family Residences

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The applicant is seeking approval for a conditional use for shared parking between two adjacent lots. The request came about as part of a building permit application for a rear addition to the existing home at 10 University Avenue. Adjacent properties are owned by Beta Theta Pi except for one Miami University parcel. The garage being used for 10 University Avenue is not on the same lot as the home. The Oxford Zoning Code requires parking and site access conditions be brought into compliance as part of an addition to a structure. Currently the parking/storage of vehicles is not on the same lot as the house. Therefore the shared parking across the lot line would have to be eliminated, variances be sought, or a conditional use be reviewed and approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public notices were mailed to surrounding property owners and a notice sign was placed on the property. No comments were received as of this writing.

AGENCY REVIEWS

Requests for review were made to the Police, Fire, Engineering and Economic Development Departments. The following comments have been received:

Police:	Returned without comments.
Fire:	Returned without comments.
Engineering:	Returned without comments.
Econ. Dev.:	Returned without comments.

ZONING CODE REVIEW

Below is an excerpt of Oxford Zoning Code Section 1149.02 Parking and Site Access:

(a) Any new development, redevelopment, or change to a use or structure or site (whether conforming or nonconforming) shall meet the current parking and site access regulations for the entire use and structure and site. Any nonconforming uses, structures or sites shall follow the provisions in Chapter 1137.

Regarding subsection A, above, the proposal is considered a change to the structure.

Below is an excerpt from Oxford Zoning Code Section 1147.03, recently revised in March 2015 by City Council via Ordinances 3307 and 3308:

(34) Off-site Parking and Shared-Use Parking

A. Potential Concerns

1. Adequate supply of spaces for all modes of transportation
2. Distance from use
3. Hours of operation/schedule conflict
4. Valet service
5. Proximity to mass transit
6. Accommodation for special needs/accessibility
7. Maintenance responsibility
8. Future land use changes/parking demand

B. Regulations

1. Recorded easement agreement
2. Specific distance limit for off-site
3. Performance review timeframe
4. Requires evidence justifying sufficient parking

Regarding subsection (34)B, above:

1. Although both properties are owned by the same entity, a recorded easement could be established to guarantee the parking use for any ownership change. Additionally, the requirement could be waived.
2. The site is adjacent; therefore, this is not applicable.
3. Zoning Code requires two parking spaces for the single-family use. Two spaces can be provided in the existing garage.

General Decision Standards for Conditional Uses — Section 1147.02(c)(2)

(2) General Decision Standards. All Conditional Uses shall satisfy these General Decision Standards.

A. The proposed use is in fact a Conditional Use appropriate for in the zoning district in which it is proposed.

Yes, the use can be allowed as a conditional use.

B. The use and site will satisfy the general intent of this Zoning Code.

Yes, the proposed enclosure will satisfy.

C. The use and site will be compatible with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Not applicable.

D. The size and shape of the site are sufficient for the proposed use.

The size and shape of the site is sufficient for the proposed use.

E. The use will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or potential future neighboring uses that are permitted in the zoning district.

None anticipated.

F. The use will not involve activities, processes, materials, equipment, or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any person, property, or the general welfare because of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors, or other emissions.

Not applicable.

G. The only accessory uses will be directly related to the operation of the principal use and will not be operated independent of the principal use.

Parking is the accessory use in this case.

H. The use and site will be adequately served by public facilities and services such as streets, water and sewer, drainage structures, police and fire protection, and refuse disposal, or adequate provisions will be made to provide the same services privately.

The parking area in question is accessed by a privately owned driveway.

I. Development of the site and operation of the use will not require substantial public expenditure for additional infrastructure or services.

None is expected.

J. The site will be designed, constructed, and maintained in a character harmonious in appearance and general character with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area. Structures to be constructed, reconstructed, or altered in a residential zoning district shall have the appearance of residential buildings permitted in the zoning district.

The shared parking is existing and appears to be harmonious in appearance and character to the area.

K. The site is designed so that on-site traffic and traffic accessing the site will not inappropriately impact the movement of traffic on adjacent public streets.

The use is existing and the detached garage parking is existing.

L. Proposed construction will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

The structure is a historic building in the University District Historic overlay. The addition was reviewed and approved by the Oxford Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission.

M. All necessary permits and licenses for the Conditional Use and its operation have been or can be obtained for the use at the proposed location.

Yes, as stated by applicant.

ANALYSIS

The existing shared parking and pavement setback are legal nonconforming conditions. However, the addition requires them to be corrected. The applicant has chosen the conditional use route versus altering the site or seeking variances. Continuing the existing conditions would have no additional adverse impact to the area. In addition to the shared / off-site parking, other nonconformities are:

1. Inadequate drive aisle and parking space setback
2. Two lots without street frontage
3. Inadequate lot width
4. Inadequate rear setback

Beta is proposing to bring conformance to items 2,3 and 4 with this project by consolidating 5 of the 6 lots they own. The resulting parcel would be similar to a flag lot because of its narrow frontage on High Street, but is not a flag lot because of its primary frontage on University Avenue. The lot would be considered a "through lot."

RECOMMENDATION

This is a minor application of the new conditional use provisions adopted earlier this year. An approval of the proposed shared parking conditional use, with waivers noted, satisfies the general intent of the zoning code. Additionally, the number of nonconformities are decreased. Staff recommends that a recommendation of approval be forwarded to City Council.

SUBMITTED BY:

Sam Perry, AICP
Planner

DATE: October 7, 2015

ATTACHMENT

(c) Planning Commission Review. The Planning Commission shall base its review of a proposed Conditional Use upon the complete application, upon any staff report, and upon any relevant and credible public comment presented during the public hearing. If the Planning Commission finds that the information provided is insufficient to make a determination, it may suspend its review until sufficient information has been provided.

(1) Burden of proof.

A. Planning Commission has no obligation to recommend approval and City Council has no obligation to approve a Conditional Use. This Zoning Code assumes that the uses listed in this section are not appropriate unless an Applicant proves that the use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the City or the neighborhood in which it is proposed.

B. Applicants shall prove that potential negative impacts of elements such as location, size and extent of facilities and operations, site design, traffic generation, site access, and potential impact upon public facilities will be adequately mitigated.

(2) General decision standards. All Conditional Uses shall satisfy these General Decision Standards:

A. The proposed use is in fact a Conditional Use in the zoning district in which it is proposed.

B. The use and site will satisfy the general intent of this Zoning Code.

C. The use and site will be compatible with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

D. The size and shape of the site are sufficient for the proposed use.

E. The use will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or potential future neighboring uses that are permitted in the zoning district.

F. The use will not involve activities, processes, materials, equipment, or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any person, property, or the general welfare because of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors, or other emissions.

G. The only accessory uses will be directly related to the operation of the principal use and will not be operated independent of the principal use.

H. The use and site will be adequately served by public facilities and services such as streets, water and sewer, drainage structures, police and fire protection, and refuse disposal, or adequate provisions will be made to provide the same services privately.

I. Development of the site and operation of the use will not require substantial public expenditure for additional infrastructure or services.

J. The site will be designed, constructed, and maintained in a character harmonious in appearance and general character with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, and that such use will not change the essential character of the

same area. Structures to be constructed, reconstructed, or altered in a residential zoning district shall have the appearance of residential buildings permitted in the zoning district.

K. The site is designed so that on-site traffic and traffic accessing the site will not inappropriately impact the movement of traffic on adjacent public streets.

L. Proposed construction will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

M. All necessary permits and licenses for the Conditional Use and its operation have been or can be obtained for the use at the proposed location.

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Econ Dev Department

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-22 CONDITIONAL USE, 10 University Avenue, to allow for shared use parking, **Paul Brokamp, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than: **10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

Drawings reviewed by: _____ Date: 9-14-15

John Detherage
PRINTED NAME

RECEIVED
SEP 11 2015
City of Oxford
Service Department

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Econ Dev Department

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-22 CONDITIONAL USE, 10 University Avenue, to allow for shared use parking, **Paul Brokamp, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than: **10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

Drawings reviewed by: V. Popescu Date: 9-29-15

VICTOR POPESCU
PRINTED NAME

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Econ Dev Department

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-22 CONDITIONAL USE, 10 University Avenue, to allow for shared use parking, **Paul Brokamp, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than: **10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

Drawings reviewed by: R.B. Holzworth Date: 9/15/2015

R.B. HOLZWORTH
PRINTED NAME

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Econ Dev Department

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-22 CONDITIONAL USE, 10 University Avenue, to allow for shared use parking, **Paul Brokamp, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than: **10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

Drawings reviewed by: _____ Date: 9-18-15

G. ALAN RYCRAFT
PRINTED NAME

CITY OF OXFORD
HOME OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY

PC-2015-22
Surrounding Property Owners Map

Legend

- Subject Properties
- 200 Ft. Buffer
- Oxford Corp. Limit
- Address Point
- Parcel
- Building Footprint
- Paved Roadway

N

1 inch = 100 feet

Prepared on Tuesday, September 08, 2015

The City of Oxford does not guarantee the dimensional accuracy of this map. Precise dimensional accuracy should be based upon recorded deeds, plats or a professional survey.



BETA THETA PI

MEN OF PRINCIPLE

LETTER OF AGENCY

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that Paul Brokamp (VSWC Architects) have permission to represent our interest with the City of Oxford and act on our behalf for the HAPC hearing at their next scheduled date regarding the renovation at our property located at 10 North University, Oxford, Ohio 45056.

Thank-you,

Signed: _____ Date: 8/13/15

Judson Horras
Beta Theta Pi

Brennan Hall | 5134 Bonham Road | PO Box 6277 | Oxford, Ohio 45056 | 800.800.BETA | Fax 513.523.2381 | www.betathetapi.org

CITY OF OXFORD
HOME OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY

Internal Use Only:	
Case No.	PC-2015-22
Date Filed	8/28/15

Conditional Use Permit Application

Applicant Information

Attach a Letter of Agency if the Applicant is not the property owner.

Name * PAUL J. BROKAMP

Mailing Address * 414 READING ROAD

City, State & Zip Code * MASON, OH. 45040

Telephone Number(s) * 513-398-4931

Email Address paul@vsvg.com

Owner Information

Name * BETA THETA PI

Mailing Address * 5134 BONHAM ROAD

City, State & Zip Code * OXFORD, OH 45056

Telephone Number(s) * 800-800-BETA

Email Address

Location and Lot Information

Location of Property * 10 UNIVERSITY

Legal Description * SEE ATTACHED

Zoning District * R-2MS

Total Area * 9,040 S.F. → *Check One* * Acres ☐ Square Feet ☒

Existing Use Description * SGL. FAMILY RESIDENCE

Proposed Use Description * SGL. FAMILY RESIDENCE Shared Use parking

Submission Requirements and Documentation

From Section 1147.02(a)[1].

(1) Contents of application for conditional use permit. Thirteen complete sets of all information shall be submitted with an application. The Zoning Administrator may modify this requirement based upon the type of materials included. Please contact the Zoning Administrator prior to submitting an application to discuss the submission requirement. If any information is submitted in color or on non-standard paper, more copies may be required.

A. Application Fee.

B. Description of Use and Site.

A written, detailed description shall include the following information. A separate response is required for each subsection.

1. The name, mailing address, and telephone number of the applicant and the property owner.
2. If the applicant is not the owner, a statement from the owner that the applicant is entitled to apply on his or her behalf.
3. A legal description of the site, including all separate lots.

A. The proposed use is in fact a Conditional Use appropriate for the zoning district in which it is proposed.
B. The use and site will satisfy the general intent of this Zoning Code.
C. The use and site will be compatible with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan.
D. The size and shape of the site are sufficient for the proposed use.
E. The use will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or potential future neighboring uses that are permitted in the zoning district.
F. The use will not involve activities, processes, materials, equipment, or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any person, property, or the general welfare because of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors, or other emissions.
G. The only accessory uses will be directly related to the operation of the principal use and will not be operated independent of the principal use.
H. The use and site will be adequately served by public facilities and services such as streets, water and sewer, drainage structures, police and fire protection, and refuse disposal, or adequate provisions will be made to provide the same services privately.
I. Development of the site and operation of the use will not require substantial public expenditure for additional infrastructure or services.
J. The site will be designed, constructed, and maintained in a character harmonious in appearance and general character with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area. Structures to be constructed, reconstructed, or altered in a residential zoning district shall have the appearance of residential buildings permitted in the zoning district.
K. The site is designed so that on-site traffic and traffic accessing the site will not inappropriately impact the movement of traffic on adjacent public streets.
L. Proposed construction will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.
M. All necessary permits and licenses for the Conditional Use and its operation have been or can be obtained for the use at the proposed location.

Fees & Receipt

The required fee is $400.00, plus postage charge. Write a check payable to **City of Oxford**. You may also pay in-person using Visa, MasterCard, and Discover. To calculate the postage charge, multiply the number of adjoining properties by current postage rate[3].

Sign and Date

Applicant Signature * Paul Bridges

Date * 8/27/15

Submit Application, Submission Requirements and Documentation, and Fees

We will not accept incomplete applications and/or plans and documentation.

Send or drop off this application with required plans and documentation as attachments and a check for fee and postage charges made payable to **City of Oxford**, to Community Development Director, 101 East High Street, Oxford, OH 45056.

Direct questions to the Community Development Dept. at (513) 524-5204. The application will be placed on the next possible agenda.

Note: You must adhere to notification and publication requirements. Submit materials 45 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting on which the action is requested. City Staff will place a public hearing sign on the subject property. **The Applicant is responsible for removing the signage at the completion of the hearing(s).**

For Staff Use Only

Fee Paid Date * 8/28/15 Receipt Number * 58931

[1] City of Oxford Codified Ordinances: http://www.cityofoxford.org/fees-ordinances-and-charter/
[2] Butler County Auditor Real Estate Search: http://www.butlercountyauditor.org/
[3] The United States Postal Service: http://www.usps.com/

VSWC Architects

Beta Theta Pi
University Residence - Addition and Remodel

10 North University Ave
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Conditional Use Permit Application

Section 1147.02(a):
(1) Contents of application for conditional use permit.

A. Application Fee.
B. Description of Use and Site.

1. Applicant:
Paul Brokamp
VSWC Architects
414 Reading Road
Mason, Ohio 45040

Owner:
Beta Theta Pi
~~10 University Ave~~ 5134 Bonham Rd.
Oxford, Ohio 45056

2. See attached Letter of Agent.

3. Legal Description: (The house currently sits on four separate parcels acting as one property with a private drive on a fifth parcel.)

Owner 1	BETA THETA PI	
1 of 4:	282 N40 OF N 1/2 & PT VAC ST	CONS W/16
2 of 4:	281 N50 OF E26	CONS W/20
3 of 4:	281 N40 OF E26 & PT VAC ST	CONS W/21
4 of 4:	282 N50 OF S 1/2 & PT VAC ST	CONS W/17
Private Drive:	281 E 20 OF W 26.5 OF	S177 1/4

4. Existing Use: Single-Family Residence

5. Zoning District: R-2MS

6. Proposed Use: Single-Family Residence (Unchanged)]

7. The proposed use of the property is to continue to serve as a single-family home.

7a. The use is similar to uses on neighboring properties. All adjacent properties to the south, west and north are also within the R2MS Zoning District. They appear to be one single-family residence and two multi-family residences.
All properties across the University Avenue are with in the MU Zoning District. They have the appearance of three, separate single-family homes.

7b. Three buildings sit on University Ave between East High Street and East Church Street.

10 University is a two-story home which sits in the middle of the block and faces University Avenue. It's primary facade (its East Elevation) faces University Avenue and reads as a one-and-a-half story brick and lap siding Cape Cod home. It was designed in 1941 by the Architect Charles Cellarius who designed many buildings on Miami University's campus. It is set back from the street approximately 52 feet which equates to approximately 32 feet from the front property line. This distance includes a 16.5' section vacated to the City of Oxford. It's rear facade is approximately 37.5' from the rear property line.

The proposed addition extends from the house where a one-car garage was originally located. The garage was converted to a Family room in the 1990s, and the driveway was removed. A brick paver patio was added later in that area along with extensive landscaping.

10 University shares a drive and parking area as well as a garage with 20 University. Both are properties owned by Beta Theta Pi, and are both accessed by a private drive that runs between East Church Street and East High Street. The drive has the appearance of a public way, but it in fact owned by Beta Theta Pi.

East of 10 University, across University Avenue and offset to the north sits a story-and-a-half residence. Its primary entrance seems to be from the back where three parking spaces and a two-car garage connect to the alley. It appears to have a two-story, gabled-roofed addition as well as the aforementioned garage. To the north and south of that building are similar buildings which also have vehicular access and parking off the alley.

South of 10 University on the adjoining lot sits a two-story, wood frame structure known as the Lottie Moon House. The building sits to the northwest corner of its property, and its University Avenue facade, its east facade, is in general alignment with the front facade of 10 University. On the west, its opposite facade sits approximately 15 feet from the private drive. It has a paved parking area between it and 10 University, and it extends to the north to the property line of 10 University. The access off of the private drive allows vehicular access to the Lottie Moon House without added curb cuts or drives off of East High Street or University Avenue. This area is also used for recycling and garbage containers keeping them off the primary streets. There is an approximately 6 foot high privacy fence between the two properties along the west half of the boundary line.

West of 10 University and across the private drive is a lawn which extends from East Hight Street to a property line even with the north boundary of 10 University. To the north of the lawn sits a two-story, multi-family residence which is owned by the Evans Scholars. Both the lawn and the multi-family residence contain a 16 foot right-of-way owned by the City of Oxford.

A 6 foot high privacy fence runs along the private drive at the far west boundary of 10 University, and the fence shields the yard and patio behind 10 University. Both the yard and the patio would remain after the proposed alterations are completed.

North of 10 University on the adjoining lot sits a two-story, multi-family residence which sits in the middle of its lot half way between University Avenue and the private drive. It has a garage which sits to its southwest corner. Again, it is owned by Beta Theta Pi, the same owner as 10 University.

10 University currently has significantly greater built setbacks than the buildings to the south and north and all three properties across University Avenue. With the proposed addition it will continue to have significantly greater setbacks than those buildings. All properties in the area have extensive landscaping and plantings, and the landscaping on 10 University will minimize the visibility of the addition from the public way along University Avenue. The proposed addition would not be readily visible from University Avenue or Church Street, and it would only be partially visible from High Street and would match the portion of the existing building which is also partially visible from High Street.

7c. No potential nuisances are foreseen.

7d. As the proposed addition is in keeping with the existing architecture and materials of the back facade of 10 University and as the proposed addition will still sit well within the profile of the buildings to the north and south there are no negative affects foreseen.

8. This location is appropriate for this use as it is the continuation of use as a residence by this Owner dating back to 1941. The proposed addition kitchen replaces a narrow 8 foot by 11 foot galley-style kitchen with a larger 10 foot by 15 foot kitchen designed to meet contemporary residential needs. The proposed addition also provides a master bathroom in keeping with contemporary standards.

9. The proposed use continues the current use of the property which is as the residence of the Beta Theta Pi Administrative Secretary.

10. As the R-2MS district "is designed to preserve and encourage a mix of single family and two-family residences," and as the proposed addition allows the property's continued unchanged use as a single-family residence no potential concerns for the this use are anticipated. None are known to have been expressed regarding its current use.

11. Properties within 200 feet of 10 University per Butler County Auditor starting with the adjoining property to the south and proceeding clockwise:

001:	(H4000002000001) PRES & TRS OF MIAMI U	HIGH ST
018, 019:	MIAMI UNIVERSITY	220 E HIGH ST
013:	BETA THETA PI	E HIGH ST
011, 012:	PRESIDENT & TR OF THE MIAMI U	HIGH ST
051:	ALPHA CHAPTER HOUSE CO OF BETA THETA PI	208 E HIGH ST
050:	ALPHA CHAPTER HOUSE CO OF BETA THETA PI	200 E HIGH ST
003, 006:	DANMARK INVESTMENT GROUP LLC	15 N CAMPUS AVE
004	TRES WALNUIT LLC	201 E Church St
005	TRES WALNUIT LLC	205 E Church St
009, 010	EVANS SCHOLARS	219 E Church St
014, 049:	BETA THETA PI	20 UNIVERSITY AVE
177	DELTA ZETA FOUDATION	202 E Church St
184	OHIO ETA HOUSE CORP	224 E Church St
059	CKC RENTALS LLC	101 University Ave
023, 028	TRS OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY	21 UNIVERSITY AVE
024, 027:	PRESIDENT & TRS OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY	15 UNIVERSITY AVE
025, 026:	PRES & TRS OF MIAMI U	300 E HIGH ST

All properties are in Oxford, Ohio 45056

12. The proposed addition to 10 University Avenue would not change the existing use. It would not remove any existing landscaping or add any paved surfaces. Again, materials are selected to integrate with the existing Cape Cod's shed dormer appearance. The new roof will match the existing shed dormer's pitch of 6 inches per foot. The new roof will be drained with a system connected to the properties existing storm sewer connection.

The home's existing trees and longterm landscaping are maintained throughout the property, and to the north and east they greatly reduce visibility of the addition from University Avenue. Along the private drive and from neighboring properties with a view, it would add visual interest to the back of the house with the new planting bed and a trellis.



Site Plan

scale: 1" =20'-0"

Shared parking

Beta Theta Pi

Single Family Residence - Addition and Remodel

10 North University Avenue Oxford, Ohio 45056

VSWC Architects
414 Reading Road
Mason, Ohio 45040
513-398-4931

VOL. ____, PAGE ____
BUTLER COUNTY ENGINEER
RECORD OF LAND SURVEY

NORTH: RELATIVE TO AN EXISTING SURVEY OF RECORD AS RE CORDED IN SURVEY VOLUME 7, PG. 199 OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO RECORDS.



DENOTES: SET 5/8" IRON PIN & CAP (#7862) UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

GRAPHIC SCALE

30 0 15 30 60 120

(IN FEET)
1 inch = 30 ft.

SURVEY NOTES:

DOCUMENTS USED IN THIS SURVEY ARE SHOWN HEREON.

OCCUPATION IN GENERAL FITS THE SURVEY EXCEPT AS SHOWN.

MONUMENTATION FOUND IS IN GOOD CONDITION.

THIS PLAT MADE PURSUANT TO SECTION 5713.16 OF THE OHIO REVISED CODE

Note: All Set 5/8" Iron Pin & Cap Shall Have A Yellow Cap Stamped With "RTA-6021 ABERCROMBIE & ASSOC INC SLC-7862"

I Hereby Certify That This Is A True And Accurate Survey Done By Me And Under My Direction And That All Monuments Have Been Found Or Set As Shown.

Stephen L. Cahill, P.S.
Ohio Registered Surveyor #7862

PLAT OF SURVEY

REVISIONS

UNIVERSITY AVENUE
CITY OF OXFORD
BUTLER COUNTY, OHIO

Abercrombie & Associates, Inc.
Civil Engineering + Surveying
3377 Compton Road, Suite 120 • Cincinnati, Ohio 45251
513-385-5757 • www.abercrombie-associates.com

DWG: JC-SMPT	SCALE	DATE	JOB NO.	DRAWN	
	1" = 30'	9-10-15	15-0132	J.C.	1 / 1

Front Elevation from NE Corner

Back Elevation from NW Corner

Existing Exterior Photographs

Beta Theta Pi

University Residence - Addition and Remodel

10 North University Avenue Oxford, Ohio 45056

Project No:

Issued: 7-31-15

Revised:

Not Published
All Rights Reserved
This document is the product and exclusive property of the Architect. This document and the information it contains may not be copied or used for other than the specific purpose for which it was prepared without written consent of VSWC Architects, Inc.
COPYRIGHT © 2013

VSWC Architects
414 Reading Road
Mason, Ohio 45040
513-398-4931
Listening Leading Creating

Sheet No.

A5



1 A4 West Elevation

2 A4 North Elevation



Site Plan



3 A4 South Elevation

Numbered Notes:

1. New shingles and shingle wall steps with cant, or edge at rake. Wood shingles 5" exposure on side wall or where conditioned air spacing. Confirm spacing with client & architect at selected work area.
2. James Hardie Building Products HardiePanel® Lap Siding Select Cedarmill siding with 'Hand Finish' vertical grained texture and smoothness similar to existing brick wall. Painted, color to match existing.
3. James Hardie Building Products HardieTrim 4/4 NTB Smooth trim board, 3/4" x 3 1/2" nailed after Painted, color to match existing.
4. James Hardie Building Products HardieTrim 4/4 NTB Smooth trim board, 3/4" x 7 1/4" nailed after Painted, color to match existing.
5. Replace damaged 6 1/2" thick brick patterns every 4" concrete stacked ornamental with Yorkstone concrete slab to remain. Use 6" (and) 48 domestic @ 24" o.c. fully grouted into ex. slab.
6. Replace damaged 6 1/2" thick brick patterns every 4" concrete stacked ornamental with Yorkstone concrete slab to remain. Use 6" (and) 48 domestic @ 24" o.c. fully grouted into ex. slab.
7. PVC [illegible]
8. [illegible]

9. Remove existing aluminum clad, aluminum windows, shuttered metal roof and gutters and as required for [illegible]
10. New gutter and downspout to match existing. Tie all new downspouts into existing storm piping.
11. [illegible]
12. Existing to remain, including [illegible]
13. New arched arbor molding to match profile of adjoining brick pilasters.
14. New 6'-0" W x 6'-0" H wood entry courtyard to reference historic Dentist unit. (3" wing x 8" thk. Sandstone or equal) and based through the cement siding to wood structure.
15. Verify dimensions in field, in align with address at ex. buildings or [illegible]
16. New 6'-0" W x 6'-0" H wood entry courtyard to reference historic Dentist unit. (3" wing x 8" thk. Sandstone or equal) and based through the cement siding to wood structure.
17. Existing utility connections.
18. Existing vehicle to remain.
19. Existing brick walk.

20. Ex. tree to remain and protect.
21. Renovation molding to match existing at ex. [illegible]
22. New arched arbor to match existing brick wall.
23. New arched arbor to match existing brick wall.
24. Replace ex. wooden louvers with new [illegible]

Exterior Elevations and Site Plan	Project No: 1-04-16
Beta Theta Pi	Revisions:
University Residence - Addition and Remodel	
10 North University Avenue, Oxford, Ohio 45056	
VSWC Architects	Sheet No: A4

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Community Development
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: November 3, 2015

Account Code No. #:

Jung-Han Chen
Prepared By:

Budgeted Amount:

October 20, 2015
Date Prepared:

PC-2015-23 PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, 5990 Contreras Road, one acre, **Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent**

Recommendation by the Planning Commission: Approval with Conditions

Discussion:
The applicant is seeking a Preliminary Planned Development approval for the property. The applicant is seeking approval to reconfigure the existing residence into a maximum of three (3) dwelling units, and potentially a professional office.

The structure was built in 1896 and has many distinctive features and historical significance that the community should cherish. It is known as the Welsh-Stewart House by many local residents for its Queen Anne Victorian style. Furthermore, it was also the home of a prominent local member, Josiah Allen Welsh, as well as Dr. William T. Stewart. The original two-story brick house has approximately 3740 square feet, which was significantly larger than any house of that time. Subsequently, an addition was added on to increase the footage of the house to over 5,000 square feet. Preservation of cultural and historic resources is specifically highlighted in the Comprehensive Plan.

A lengthy discussion took place regarding this proposal related to the neighborhood and more specifically the office portion to the neighborhood. The Planning Commission spent a great deal of time making certain the proposed uses will not be detrimental to the neighborhood with many considerations. The Commission voted 4-0-0 to recommend approval of this Preliminary Planned Development subject to the following conditions:

1) The use shall be limited to a maximum of three dwelling units or two dwelling units and one professional office (limited to those uses specifically enumerated in Oxford Zoning Code 1159.17).

2) Maximum occupancy of any dwelling unit for which a rental permit is required shall be 4-persons, no more than two of which may be unrelated unless constituting a family as allowed in Oxford Zoning Code 1146.02 (a) and (b).

3) The office use shall be limited to a maximum of 2,500 sq. ft.

4) Any sign for the Professional Office shall conform to Oxford Zoning Code 1151.05 (1), except only a free-standing sign will be permitted and the design of the sign shall be in harmony with the historic character of the home.

5) The footprint of the home shall not be expanded, and the exterior of the home shall be maintained as closely as possible to how it currently exists, with changes only as required to meet current building and fire codes for ingress/egress the new uses and with any required changes to be designed and constructed in consideration and observance of the historical features of the structure.

6) The hours of operation of the professional office shall be limited to 8 am to 8 pm.

7) The PUD shall in all other respects comply with Oxford Zoning Code 1143.09 RO Office Residential District.

Approved By:

Department Head: JHC / 10/27/15
City Attorney: /
City Manager: DJE / 10/30/15

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE ACCEPTING THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION FOR PRELIMINARY PLAN APPROVAL OF A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT FOR ONE (1) ACRE OF LAND AT 5990 CONTRERAS ROAD OXFORD, OHIO 45056 TO ALLOW THE RECONFIGURATION OF AN EXISTING STRUCTURE FOR RESIDENTIAL AND OFFICE USES WITH CONDITIONS.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: Council hereby finds that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 13, 2015, in accordance with Section 1145 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Oxford, on the application of Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent for approval of a Preliminary Plan for one (1) acre of land at 5990 Contreras Road Oxford, Ohio 45056 to allow the reconfiguration of an existing structure for residential and office uses.

SECTION 2: The Planning Commission, after due deliberation found the application satisfies the code requirements in Chapter 1145 of the Oxford Zoning Code and recommended approval of the Preliminary Plan application for one (1) acre of land at 5990 Contreras Road Oxford, Ohio 45056 with conditions.

SECTION 3: Council hereby accepts the recommendation of the Planning Commission and further approves the Preliminary Plan application for one (1) acre of land at 5990 Contreras Road Oxford, Ohio 45056 to allow the reconfiguration of an existing structure for residential and office uses based on the submittals of the applicant that are incorporated and made a part of this approval with the following conditions:

a. The use shall be limited to a maximum of 3 dwelling units **(the current efficiency apartment and 2 additional units)** or 2 dwelling units **(the current efficiency apartment and 1 additional unit)** and 1 professional office (limited to those uses specifically enumerated in Oxford Zoning Code Section 1159.17).
b. Maximum occupancy of any dwelling unit for which a rental permit is required shall be 4 persons, no more than two of which may be unrelated unless constituting a family as allowed in Oxford Zoning Code Sections 1146.02(a) and 1146.02(b).
c. The office use shall be limited to a maximum of 2,500 square feet.
d. Any sign for the Professional Office shall conform to Oxford Zoning Code Section 1151.05(a)(1) except only a free-standing sign will be permitted and the design of the sign shall be in harmony with the historic character of the home.

e. The footprint of the home shall not be expanded, and the exterior of the home shall be maintained as closely as possible to how it currently exists, with changes only as required to meet current building and fire codes for ingress/egress of the new uses and any required changes shall be designed and constructed in consideration and observance of the historical features of the structure.

f. The hours of operation of the professional office shall be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

g. The Planned Development shall in all other respects comply with Oxford Zoning Code Section 1143.09 RO Office Residential District.

SECTION 4: This Ordinance shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW(STAFF)

Certification of Action
Oxford Planning Commission
Recommendation to City Council

Report Date	November 3, 2015
Case Number	PC-2015-23
Applicant Information	Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent
Requested Action	Preliminary Planned Development
Summary of Request	To allow for a Planned Development on one acre of land, located at 5990 Contreras Road, Oxford, Ohio
Public Hearing Information	A Public Hearing took place at 118 W. High Street on October 13, 2015. A Public Hearing notice was published in the Journal News on September 7, 2015 and courtesy notices were mailed to adjacent property owners on September 11, 2015. Signage was posted at the site on October 6, 2015.
Commission Action	The Planning Commission voted 4-0-0 recommending approval with multiple conditions of the Preliminary Planned Development.
Commission Findings and Conclusions	Staff went through the Planned Development Decision Standards for this request and felt that the site was sufficiently large and should be properly preserved. The Planning Commission listened to the applicant's proposal and heard public comments. After the public hearing, the Planning Commission had a lengthy discussion about the site, building and the proposed uses, along with the historic preservation aspect of the house to the neighborhood and voted 4-0-0 to approve the Preliminary Planned Development of this project, subject to seven conditions, which are listed in the Staff Summary Staff Report on the following page.
Exhibits Submitted to the Commission	1. Staff Report Dated October 6, 2015 2. Interoffice Review Transmittal Sheets 3. Property Notification Map 4. Review and Comment Form 5. Letter of Agency 6. Plat of Survey Provided by Owner 10/14/2015 7. Planned Development Application August 28, 2015 8. Supporting Documents from Applicant

City of Oxford
Community Development Department
STAFF REPORT
Planning Commission

Case # PC-2015-23 **Date –October 13, 2015**

APPLICATION

Applicant:	Scott Webb, Agent/Applicant
Location:	5990 Contreras Road
Owner:	Peter and Connie McCarthy
Action Request:	Preliminary Planned Development
Current Use:	Single-Family
Zoning:	R1B (Single-Family Medium Density Residential) District
Surrounding Existing Land Uses:	Single and Two-Family and Multi-Family Dwelling

GENERAL DESCRIPTION
The applicant is seeking a Preliminary Planned Development approval for the property. Based on the narrative, the applicant is seeking for approval to reconfigure the existing residence into a maximum of three (3) dwelling units, and potentially a professional office.

The property is bordered by a multi-dwelling rental property to the east, single family to the south, north and west. This area is in proximity to Lynn Avenue where commercial activities are prominent.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Public notices were mailed to surrounding property owners. No responses were received.

PROPERTY HISTORY

PC-2010-04	Rezoning from R1B to RO- Recommended by PC and subsequently denied by Council
PC-2010-08-ADM-	Lot Split (withdrawn)
PC-2010—09-ADM-	Lot Split (Referred to BZA for adjudication hearing for not meeting certain underlying zoning requirement)
PC-2015-16	Zoning Map amendment from R1B to R3 (withdrawn)

AGENCY REVIEWS
Requests for review were made to the Police, Fire, Engineering and Economic Development Departments. The following comments have been received:

Police:	Returned without comments.
Fire:	Returned without comments.
Engineering:	Returned without comments.
Econ. Dev.:	Returned with comments.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW

A Comprehensive Plan is a broad policy document intended to guide decision-making on long-term physical development. The Ohio Planning and Zoning Law Handbook even provides a more rigorous legal definition of a Comprehensive Plan, which is a chief policy instrument for: (1) the administration of zoning and subdivision regulations; (2) the location and classification of streets and thoroughfares; (3) the location and construction of public and semi-public buildings and related community facilities and infrastructure…..etc.

It provides the frame work to be used on a daily basis as public and private decisions are made concerning development. Administrative and legislative approvals of development proposal, including rezoning and subdivision plats, should be a central means of implementing the Comprehensive Plan. Decision by the Planning Commission should reference relevant Comprehensive Plan recommendation and policies.

There are many goals and objectives as outlined in the Comp Plan as what the community at large vision what this community would like. Various goals and objectives may seem contradictory and inconsistent; it is the purview for the City Council, Planning Commission, with the assistance from staff, to find the balance between these goals and objectives when reviewing development projects.

Relevant information from the 2008 Comprehensive Plan is provided as follows for discussion:

Land Use Chapter:

The map titled "Conservation and Development Map" on page 3.19 showed the aspiration and choices that are expressed by the community in 2008.

The area considered for redevelopment is mainly defined between Lynn Avenue and Locust Street between College Avenue and McGuffey Avenue. The subject property is adjacent to this redevelopment area. The intent of this redevelopment is to create a mixture of small and medium sized commercial uses with a well-defined landscape and public space; where residential uses shall also be integrated within the area to create a 24 hour district to create shopping and dining options within walking distance of surrounding neighborhoods.

The subject area is also considered Neighborhood General 3 under the Character Map Matrix on page 3.20, since the development of this area tends to be after WWII and does not share the same geographic configuration as the Mile Square. This character of the neighborhood is considered to be residential areas on the outskirts of the Mile Square with the lowest residential density.

Cultural Resources:

Enhance and improve the promotion and preservation of the City's historic and cultural resources. There is a large historic building located on the subject property that should be preserved.

The Comp Plan also supports and encourages the preservation, restoration, rehabilitation and reuse of historic structures and sites. Additionally, it is also recommended in the Comp Plan to consider historic and cultural resources in all land use decisions.

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

Chapter 1145 Planned Development purpose statement provides the rationale and framework for consideration. Furthermore, the goals of any proposed planned development shall at minimum address the proposal in relation to the common goals of the Planned Development under Chapter 1145.01 and they are:

A. Protect the neighbors of a planned development and the City in general to at least the same degree normally inherent in the Zoning Code.
B. Produce a development equal to or better than that resulting from single-use or traditional subdivision
C. Have a site and situation that permits comprehensive planning both on the site and relative to its immediate surroundings
D. Result in a design in which the placement, height, and uses of buildings, vehicle management areas, and open spaces efficiently utilize potentials of the site
E. Include covenants, easements, and other private measures that will help ensure the long-term administrative viability of a development
F. Be functional within a time period that helps ensure a viable development.

(2) Infill development also satisfies the following goals:

A. Fully utilize sites that could not be fully utilized because of their shape or because of their location relative to available public access.
B. Increase geographic efficiencies of existing utilities such as public streets, water, sewer, electric, telephone, and cable by using them where they are already available.
C. Help keep development from sprawling to and beyond the municipal boundaries of Oxford.

ANALYSIS:

In reviewing the planned development application, the Commission should consider both the Purpose Statement and the Decision Standards of the Zoning Code Planned Development to determine the pros and cons of the request during its deliberation.

The Planned Development Chapter also pointed out that the Planning Commission has no obligation to recommend approval and City Council has no obligation to approve a planned development. The Zoning Code assumes that a planned development is appropriate **ONLY** if an applicant proves that the proposed uses and design will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the City of the neighborhood in which it is proposed.

The Applicant shall prove that potential negative impacts of elements such as location, size and extent of facilities and operations, site design, traffic generation, site access, and potential impact upon public facilities will be adequately mitigated.

The focus of this report will be analyzing the proposal based upon the Decision Standards.

(1) The proposed planned development is in fact permitted in the zoning districts in which it is proposed.

Staff analysis:

The Planned Development provision allows any land use permitted in any residential zoning district in this code, except mobile homes, when a planned development proposal that overlays an existing zoning district.
The existing land use classification of the property is R1-B, and all permitted land uses includes multi-family dwelling and professional offices (permitted land uses under R-3 multi-family dwelling district)

(2) If the application is for the same site where a planned development application has been denied within one year, the plan is substantially different from the application so denied.

Staff analysis:

There was no previously considered Planned Development for this site within one year. This decision standard is not applicable.

(3) The uses and site plan will satisfy the general intend of this Zoning Code.

Staff analysis:

The purpose and intent of the Zoning Code is to promote and protect the public health, safety and general welfare of the people and to support the comfort and convenience of the Citizens of Oxford. Additional analysis, in relation to these decision standards concerning health, safety and general welfare of the people, is combined with the potential impact of the proposal.

(4) The uses and site plan will be compatible with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff analysis:

As written in a staff report, dated July 14 and August 11, 2015 concerning the Zoning Map Amendment, there was no direct evidence from the Comp Plan to support the site to be a multi-family dwelling. It might be arguably plausible for two-family, given the uniqueness of the size of the dwelling and the site. It certainly is an anomaly in this general vicinity. However, this site, as indicated in that particular report, was not identified as a future expansion area for commercial development.

(5) The size and shape of the site are sufficient for the proposed planned development.

Staff analysis:

The size and shape of the site would seem to be sufficient for the proposed development, without any consideration of potential impact.

(6) The use will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or potential future neighboring uses that are permitted in the zoning district.

Staff analysis:

The proposed would have a certain degree of negative impact to existing or potential future neighboring uses, which will be further analyzed in other section of the decision standards.

(7) The use will not involve activities, processes, materials, equipment, or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any person, property, or the general welfare because of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors, or other emissions.

Staff Analysis:

The narrative indicates the proposed use would be (1) three-family dwelling; and (2) professional office. The uses probably would not generate any excessive noise, smoke, fumes, as the applicant indicated in his narrative. One concern is potential number of off-street parking and the amount of traffic that might generate from the proposal.

The proposal, depending on how the configuration takes place between residential and office space, could be required to provide between 11 and 14 off-street parking spaces, which is much more than typically noted in a neighborhood such as this one. The site plan also shows those future office and residential parking spaces, to be totaled around 11 spaces, without considering garage spaces. Additionally, the traffic generated from this proposal would be much different than what a typical neighborhood would be, from a residential dwelling to a mixed use structure. Even though the site is about twice the size in footage than the properties directly west to this property, being single family dwelling unit and the difference between these properties would be noticeable as far as traffic generation is considered.

(8) Accessory uses will be directly related to the operation of the principal uses and will not be operated independent of the principal uses.

Staff Analysis:

The proposal does not seem to indicate any changes to the existing accessory structures to be utilized differently.

(9) The use and site will be adequately served by public facilities and services such as streets, water and sewer, drainage structures, police and fire protection, and refuse disposal, or adequate provisions will be made to provide the same services privately.

Staff analysis:

The site and use could be served by public utilities with adequate capacity.

(10) Development of the site and operation of the use will not require substantial public expenditure for additional infrastructure or services

Staff analysis:

No anticipated expenditure is expected to serve the proposed development.

(11) The site will be designed, constructed, and maintained in a character harmonious in appearance and general character with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area. Structures to be constructed, reconstructed, or altered in a residential zoning district shall have the appearance of residential buildings permitted in the zoning district.

Staff analysis:

The character and appearance of the building would not be altered, as indicated by the applicant, since no exterior modifications is expected. Interior modifications would not be visible from the street. However, the appearance and the character of the neighborhood may be altered to be different than the rest of the neighborhood, especially the property is considered the entrance to the neighborhood to the north and neighborhood to the west, given that potential traffic is being generated from this pending proposal, and the potential number of vehicles parked on site.

(12) The site is designed so that on-site traffic and traffic accessing the site will not adversely impact the movement or safety of all modes of traffic on adjacent public streets.

Staff analysis:

No engineering input has been provided from the City Engineer Office related to the on-site traffic and traffic accessing the site related to its impact to the safety of all modes of traffic. It would be something to review the potential impact to a major collector road from a single development site that is adjacent to a minor collector street.

(13) Proposed construction will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

Staff analysis:

It does not appear the applicant is proposing any removal of natural vegetation and no alteration or demolition to the existing building.

The proposal is seeking for an approval for a preliminary planned development to a maximum 3-dwelling unit with a professional office. One thing to bear in mind is that there are different types of professional offices, ranging from architects, lawyers, to medical, dentist and chiropractor's offices. The extent of client visit varies greatly from one type of professional office to another. It also depends how the office is configured to receive patients. Therefore, it is very unclear how the "professional office" would turn out to be. Potentially, a significant concern would be the traffic coming and going on a regular basis in and out of the site onto a major collector street. More information will be needed to ascertain the true impact from the traffic consideration. Since this is a preliminary Planned Development, many details have yet to be determined. And it is also conceivable that the details would not be available until there are specific buyers submitting proposals. Therefore, there is a sunset provision of 2 years after the approval of the preliminary planned development, with the possibility of two one-year extension from the Commission. It is not common for the Commission to review a proposal such as this one that does not have any specific end products and is subject to market demands, dealing with the adaptive re-use of an existing building.

Given that this is a planned development, the Planning Commission can and should require any and all needed information for consideration and to review the proposal to ensure the potential impact can be minimized and mitigated and the proposal poses no detrimental effect to the surrounding neighborhood.

This building was built in 1896 and has many distinctive features and historic significance that the community should cherish. It is known as Welsh-Stewart House by many local residents for its Queen Anne Victorian style. Furthermore, it was also the home of a prominent local member, Josiah Allen Welsh, as well as Dr. William T. Stewart. The original two-story brick house has approximately 3740 square feet, which was significantly larger than any houses of that time. Subsequently, an addition was added on to increase the footage of the house to over 5,000 square feet.

Preservation of cultural and historic resources is specifically highlighted in the Comp Plan and there are specific objectives to consider for land use decisions and to promote preservation of historic structures and sites. Given the size of the structure, it is not an easy task to live in a historic structure, due to the fact it would require constant maintenance, and on-going utility expenses to keep the building in a livable condition. Without a steady income flow, the cost of maintaining the structure would be hard pressed for average family, let alone major renovations that would be necessary for the upkeep of this building.

The size of the lot makes this historic home feels more like a mini-homestead that makes this site/structure even more unique, especially for the size of the structure. This almost one-acre site is part of the reason that a Planned Development approach would seem to be more appropriate with the commitment that the building will be maintained.

The current use of the site is a two-family which would be allowed continuously. It is the transitional step changing from multi-family to the east onto single family to the west of the site, which it would make land use sense for this site. The proposal of maximum 3 families would be departure from the environment of a two-family and single family. Additionally, there is a public street, classified as minor collector road, separating the multi-family residential from single family residential district.

Adding a professional office use for the site would require additional information as to how the office would be in operation. The applicant indicates that the hours of the office portion would be from 7 am to 9 pm. Other than this, there is not much more about the proposed office use for this planned development. The hours of operation would seem to be too long, considering this is a residential neighborhood.

In order to address the potential traffic concerns, the Commission may require the City Engineer to ascertain the traffic impact in and out of the site. It would also be critical to maintain vegetation, and possibly adding some more to protect and preserve the appearance of the neighborhood.

It is important for the Commission to balance the needs of maintaining, preserving, and continuing to improve this historic structure as time goes on and the community characters as a whole in the context of this Planned Development proposal. It may also require the Commission to outline specific conditions for the proposal if the Commission feels that this proposal meets the decision standards and the purpose statement of the Planned Development.

RECOMMENDATION

Reviewing the requested Planned Development Application based on the Comp Plan and the Zoning Code's Decision Standards, the application seems to be somewhat subject to market since it does not provide much detailed information, as many other Planned Development projects normally would have. And based on the analysis, the recommendation would be to consider this Planned Development to be no more than a two-family dwelling and an office. It is unclear what the rationale was when this property was rezoned to a single family in 2003. A two-family residential might be the extent of what could be supported due to the "alleged" error on the Zoning Map. Adding an office use to the structure may provide additional income to support the historic building if the potential issues could be mitigated, such as operating hours, traffic and the protection and preservation of the neighborhood character.

SUBMITTED

BY:

Jung-Han Chen
Community Development Director

DATE: October 6, 2015

ATTACHMENT

1145.06 PLANNING COMMISSION AND COUNCIL REVIEW

A preliminary plan shall be approved prior to approval of a final plan, although the processes can be concurrent for small, single phase developments
. Both preliminary and final plan approval require a Planning Commission recommendation and Council approval.

The Planning Commission shall base its review of a proposed planned development upon the complete application, upon any staff report, and upon any relevant and credible public comment presented during the public hearing. Council shall base its decision on the same materials and shall also consider the Planning Commission recommendation.

The general decision standards for approval of a preliminary and final planned development are substantially similar. The final plan requires greater detail and is subject to additional decision standards.

If, at any time, the Planning Commission or Council finds that the information provided is insufficient to make a determination, it may suspend its review until sufficient information has been provided.

(a) Burden of Proof. Planning Commission has no obligation to recommend approval and City Council has no obligation to approve a planned development. This Zoning Code assumes that a planned development is appropriate only if an applicant proves that the proposed uses and design will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the City or the neighborhood in which it is proposed.

Applicants shall prove that potential negative impacts of elements such as location, size and extent of facilities and operations, site design, traffic generation, site access, and potential impact upon public facilities will be adequately mitigated.

(b) General Decision Standards.

All planned developments shall satisfy these general decision standards:

(1) The proposed planned development is in fact permitted in the zoning districts in which it is proposed.

(2) If the application is for the same site where a planned development application has been denied within one year, the plan is substantially different from the application so denied.

(3) The uses and site plan will satisfy the general intent of this Zoning Code.

(4) The uses and site plan will be compatible with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

(5) The size and shape of the site are sufficient for the proposed planned development.

(6) The use will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or potential future neighboring uses that are permitted in the zoning district.

(7) The use will not involve activities, processes, materials, equipment, or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any person, property, or the general welfare because of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors, or other emissions.

(8) Accessory uses will be directly related to the operation of the principal uses and will not be operated independent of the principal uses.

(9) The use and site will be adequately served by public facilities and services such as streets, water and sewer, drainage structures, police and fire protection, and refuse disposal, or adequate provisions will be made to provide the same services privately.

(10) Development of the site and operation of the use will not require substantial public expenditure for additional infrastructure or services.

(11) The site will be designed, constructed, and maintained in a character harmonious in appearance and general character with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area. Structures to be constructed, reconstructed, or altered in a residential zoning district shall

have the appearance of residential buildings permitted in the zoning district.

(12) The site is designed so that on-site traffic and traffic accessing the site will not adversely impact the movement or safety of all modes of traffic on adjacent public streets.

(13) Proposed construction will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

(c) Additional Final Plan Decision Standards

(1) The final planned development shall substantially conform to the preliminary plan.

(2) Any substantial changes from the preliminary plan improve the plan or were requested by Planning Commission or Council as a part of the preliminary plan approval process.

(3) If the final plan seeks approval of only a portion of the approved preliminary plan, the elements of the proposed phase are sufficient to stand alone if the remainder of the planned development is abandoned.

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Econ Dev Department

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-23 PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, 5990 Contreras Road, one acre, **Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than**: 10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

Drawings reviewed by: _____ Date: 9-14-15

John Detherage
PRINTED NAME

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

RECEIVED
SEP 11 2015
City of Oxford
Service Department

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Economic Development

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-23 PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, 5990 Contreras Road, one acre, **Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than**: 10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

Drawings reviewed by: A. Popescu Date: 9-29-15

VICTOR POPESCU
PRINTED NAME

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Econ Dev Department

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-23 PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, 5990 Contreras Road, one acre, **Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than**: 10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

Drawings reviewed by: R.B. Holzworth Date: 9/15/2015

R.B. HOLZWORTH
PRINTED NAME

City of Oxford
Inter-Office Review Transmittal Sheet

Date: September 11, 2015

To: Fire Department Engineering Division Police Department Econ Dev Department

From: Community Development Department

PC-2015-23 PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, 5990 Contreras Road, one acre, **Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent**

____X_____ Review _____ Revisions _____Other

Please return no later than**: 10/2/2015** Note: If no comments are received, we will assume the project meets your department's standards.

Drawings are returned: w/comments without/comments

SEEMS LIKE A GOOD PLAN.
ALLOWS THE EXISTING STRUCTURE TO BE SAVED.
ALLOWS AND ADDITIONAL ~~NON~~-LOW IMPACT USE..
IT DOES NOT ASK FOR ADDITIONAL STRUCTURES TO BE BUILT.
THE CITY HAS A VERY LOW SUPPLY OF AVAILABLE OFFICE SPACE.

Drawings reviewed by: _____ Date: 9-18-15

G. ALAN KEEGAN
PRINTED NAME

"Seems like a good plan. Allows the existing structure to be saved. Allows an additional low impact use. It does not ask for additional structures to be built. The City has a very low supply of available office space."

CITY OF OXFORD
HOME OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY

PC-2015-23
Surrounding Property Owners Map

Legend

- Subject Property
- 200 Ft. Buffer
- Oxford Corp. Limit
- Address Point
- Parcel
- Building Footprint
- Paved Roadway

1 inch = 100 feet

Prepared on Tuesday, September 08, 2015

The City of Oxford does not guarantee the dimensional accuracy of this map. Precise dimensional accuracy should be based upon recorded deeds, plats or a professional survey.

CITY OF OXFORD
HOME OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY

CITY OF OXFORD
PLANNING COMMISSION
REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

CASE NO.: PC-2015-23 **DATE OF HEARING: October 13, 2015**

PC-2015-23 PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, 5990 Contreras Road, one acre, **Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent**

If you cannot attend this public hearing being held before the City of Oxford Planning Commission, but would like to comment on this matter, please complete this form and return it at your earliest convenience before the hearing date to Lynn Taylor, 101 East High Street, Oxford, OH 45056.

Name: DONALD N. NELSON

Address: 6020 JOSEPH DR.
OXFORD, OH 45056

Telephone: Home: 523-4478 Work: N/A

COMMENTS:
IF THIS WERE TO BE APPROVED MY CHIEF CONCERN IS THE POSSIBILITY OF OPENING THE DOOR FOR THE CURRENT OWNER OR SOME FUTURE OWNER TO COME BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION WITH A REQUEST (PREVIOUSLY DENIED) TO RE-ZONE THE PROPERTY THAT WOULD ALLOW IT TO BECOME MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL. IN A MATTER OF LONG-TERM STRATEGY, WOULD THIS THEN BECOME "A FOOT IN THE DOOR"? IF THERE IS ANY CHANCE THIS WOULD HAPPEN I WOULD THEN HAVE TO OPPOSE THE CURRENT REQUEST.

Donald Nelson 10/12/15
Signature Date

NEXT PAGE

"If this were to be approved, my chief concern is the possibility of opening the door for the current owner or some future owner to come back to the Planning Commission with a request (previously denied) to re-zone the property that would allow it to become multi-family residential. In a matter of long-term strategy, would this then become a "foot in the door"? If there is <u>any</u> chance this would happen, I would then have to oppose the current request."

LETTER OF AGENCY

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that Scott Webb, Architect has permission to represent our interest with the City of Oxford Board of Planning Commission and act on our behalf regarding a new Planned Development at 5990 Contreras Road

Thank-you,

Signed: Peter McCarthy

Peter McCarthy

8-24-15

Date:



VOLUME 41 PAGE 98
BUTLER COUNTY ENGINEER'S RECORD OF LAND SURVEYS

NOTES AND REFERENCES

NORTH BASED ON STATE PLANE COORDINATES NAD 83 OHIO SOUTH ZONE.

DEED REFERENCES

D.B. 1724 PG. 674
D.B. 6120 PG. 483
D.B. 6040 PG. 321
D.B. 6413 PG. 152

SURVEYS

VOL. 1 PG. 39
P.E. 759 A

GRAPHIC SCALE
0' 20' 40' 60'
1" = 20'

Submitted by owner 10/14/15

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ALL MEASUREMENTS AND MONUMENTS SET AND/OR FOUND AS SHOWN. CURVE DISTANCES ARE MEASURED ON THE ARC. ALL WORK PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE "MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR BOUNDARY SURVEYS IN THE STATE OF OHIO."

DAVID DOUGLAS SMITH PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR NO.7121

STATE OF OHIO DAVID D. SMITH S-7121 REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR

DS SURVEYING, INC.
DAVID DOUGLAS SMITH, P.S.
P.O. BOX 156
OFFICE (513) 255-4570
E-MAIL ddsmith@fuse.net

PROJECT SURVEYOR:

PROJECT TITLE:
PART OF LOT 1119
CITY OF OXFORD
BUTLER COUNTY, OHIO
FOR
PETER McCARTHY

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

DRAWN BY AJC
SCALE 1" = 20'
DATE 8/27/01
NOTES
PROJECT NO. 21094

DRAWING TITLE:
PLAT OF SURVEY

DRAWING NO. 1 / 1

CITY OF OXFORD

Internal Use Only:	
Case No.	PC-2015-23
Date Filed	8/28/15

Planned Development Application

Application Type

Choose One

☑ Preliminary ($400) ☐ Final ($400) ☐ Preliminary & Final ($400)

Applicant Information

Attach a Letter of Agency if the Applicant is not the property owner.

Name * Scott Webb, Architect

Mailing Address * 103 West Walnut Street

City, State & Zip Code * Oxford, Ohio 45056

Telephone Number * 523-3838 Email Address scott@scottwebbarchitect.com

Owner Information

Name * Peter & Constance McCarthy

Mailing Address * 5990 Contreras Road

City, State & Zip Code * Oxford, Ohio 45056

Telephone Number * 545-4459 Email Address pecomcc@gmail.com

Engineer/Surveyor Information

Name * Bayer Becker

Mailing Address * 318 South College Ave

City, State & Zip Code * Oxford, Ohio 45056

Telephone Number * 523-4270 Email Address ettareed@bayerbecker.com

Location and Lot Information

Name of Subdivision *

Location of Property * 5990 Contreras Road

Legal Description * Survey attached

Zoning District * R-1 Total Area * 1 Acres

Submission Requirements and Documentation

The application requirements (Section 1145.05[1]) for a preliminary and final planned development are different. The final planned development application requires a greater degree of accuracy and completeness than does the preliminary planned development application. This section describes the application content requirements for each step of the process.

Thirteen (13) complete sets of all information shall be submitted with each preliminary and final application. If any information is submitted in color or on non-standard paper, more copies may be required. The Zoning Administrator may modify this requirement based upon

O. Other information as required by the Planning Commission or Council.

(7) Elevations. Elevations of proposed structures or typical elevations if structures are not yet designed.

(8) Other. Photographs of the existing site and its surroundings.

(b) Final Plan.

(1) The same items and information as required for the preliminary plan, except that the approximations shall be refined to specific locations, dimensions, and descriptions.

(2) A detailed traffic impact analysis, including all modes of transportation, prepared by a qualified professional engineer

(3) Any additional description or information requested by the Planning Commission or Council during the preliminary plan approval process.

(4) Detailed agreements, contracts, deed restrictions, and sureties that will be used to guarantee performance of the development during and after construction.

Surrounding Property Owners

On a separate sheet, provide the parcel numbers, names, and mailing addresses of all property owners within 200 feet of all boundaries of the property in question. The Butler County Auditor Real Estate Search[2] is helpful when searching for the mailing address of adjoining property owners. It allows you to search by owner, address, or parcel number.

Decision Process

A preliminary plan shall be approved prior to approval of a final plan, although the processes can be concurrent for small, single phase developments. Both preliminary and final plan approval require a Planning Commission recommendation and Council approval. The review is based on the General Decision Standards found in Section 1145.06[1].

Fees & Receipt

The required fee for preliminary and final is $400.00 plus $100 per acre, plus postage charge. To calculate the postage charge, multiply the number of adjoining properties by current postage rate[3].

Sign and Date

Applicant Signature * _____

Date * 8/28/15

Submit Application, Submission Requirements and Documentation, and Fees

We will not accept incomplete applications and/or plans and documentation.

Send or drop off this application with required preliminary plans containing all required information as attachments and a check for fee and postage charges made payable to **City of Oxford**, to Community Development Director, 101 East High Street, Oxford, OH 45056.

Direct questions to the Community Development Dept. at 513-524-5204. The application will be placed on the next possible agenda.

Note: You must adhere to notification and publication requirements. Submit materials 45 days prior to the proposed Planning Commission meeting on which the action is requested. City Staff will place a public hearing sign on the subject property. **The Applicant is responsible for removing the signage at the completion of the hearing(s)**.

For Staff Use Only

Fee Paid Date * 8/28/15 Receipt Number * 58946

[1] See City of Oxford Codified Ordinances: http://www.cityofoxford.org/fees-ordinances-and-charter

[2] Butler County Auditor Real Estate Search: http://www.butlercountyauditor.org/

[3] The United States Postal Service: http://www.usps.com/

Jung Han Chen
Community Development director
City of Oxford
Municipal Building
101 E. High Street
Oxford, Ohio 45056

SCOTT
WEBB

ARCHITECT

103 West Walnut Street
Oxford, Ohio 45056
(513) 523-3838
www.scottwebbarchitect.com

Re: Application for Residential Planned Development
5990 Contreras Road

August 28, 2015

Dear Jung-Han,

Please accept this letter as a formal request for a Preliminary Plan review hearing by the City of Oxford Planning Commission and Oxford City Council for a Residential Planned Development at 5990 Contreras Road.

Attached, please find a document addressing compliance with the Design Guidelines of a Residential Planned Development

The attached proposal has been prepared for and with the help of the following:

Property Owners:

Peter & Constance McCarthy
5990 Contreras Road
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Architect:

Scott Webb, Architect
103 West Walnut Street
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Surveyor:

Bayer Becker Inc.
318 South College Avenue
Oxford, Ohio 45056

The following is the written, detailed description of the proposal as required on the Planning Application:

(5) Description of Use and Site 1145.05 (7)

A. Legal Description/Survey of the Property is included with this application

B. The Site currently contains a large residence with a small efficiency apartment located above the existing attached garage and a separate detached garage.

C. The property is currently zoned R-1. The 2003 City-wide Zoning Map Amendment made the property non-conforming based on its current configuration as a two-family residence.

D. Description of the Proposed Planned Development.

1. Planned Development is intended to allow a potential reconfiguration of the existing residence into a maximum of (3) dwelling units
2. The Planned Development application is also to allow a potential professional office in the existing residence, as would be allowed in the R-3 or RO Residential Zoning Districts. Permitted uses include professional offices of doctors, dentists, chiropractors, lawyers, engineers and similar type professions.
3. Hours of operation for such a professional office would be limited to 7:00 am to 9:00 pm.
4. The phasing of the Planned Development would be based on the potential tenant/owner of the property, and be contingent the requirements of the combination of residential and professional office uses.

E. Narrative statement evaluating the compatibility of the proposed Planned Development with the general vicinity and adjacent properties.

1. The proposed use(s) are similar to the existing land uses in the area, as this house currently sits between R-3 uses and R-1 uses, and near the Lynn Street GB Commercial District.
2. The proposal contained herein, is based on the adaptive re-use of the existing structures on the site, and does not include expansion of the building, nor any new construction.
3. Neither residential uses nor professional offices involve any operations that create potential nuisances such as excessive noise, lighting, odor, fumes, vibration, or emissions.
4. The size of the lot in relation to the location of the existing structure and the existing privacy fences provides a buffer between this proposed planned development and the neighboring properties.

F. The Planned Development in this location serves the goals of the planned development purpose statement, as it intends to permit and encourage creative and flexible land development not permitted by right.

G. The Planned Development is necessary and desirable for the neighborhood and the community, serving as a means by which this historic property can be saved through adaptive re-use.

The owners have investigated and/or applied for various zoning map amendments to allow other uses, but have met significant resistance at Planning Commission & City Council. Planned Developments provide the neighbors protection from the uses that would have been permitted by-right if the zoning district were changed.

H. All public utilities are existing & adequate for the proposed adaptive re-use/reconfiguration of the existing historic structure.

I. The traffic impact would minimal. The residential portion of the structure does not significantly increase traffic, and the potential professional office likewise generates very little traffic. Pedestrian access is accounted for through existing sidewalks along each street

J. There are no proposed easements or covenants or restrictions on the land or existing structures.

K. Mailing addresses of adjacent property owners are attached.

L. Other pertinent information:

The Cultural Resources Section of the Comprehensive Plan suggests that we should improve the promotion and preservation of the City's historic & cultural resources. This historic home should be preserved and allowing options for Adaptive Reuse works to that end. The McCarthy's applied for a received a historic marker designation for the existing historic home.

From a grand homestead on 13 acres to an oversized single family home at the edge of multi-family and commercial districts, this historic structure has become an anomaly in the district

The House contains more than 5,000 s,f of interior space on 3 stories and It sits on an acre of property, more than twice the size of the neighboring properties

The Current Zoning designation makes the property non-conforming and discourages reconfiguration of the interior and prohibits professional offices other than home occupations

The house being on the market for over 5 years as a single family home, has demonstrated a lack of interest in the R-1 use in this location

Legitimate interest has been expressed for an adaptive reuse including a professional office by more than one potential buyer

Other avenues including other Map Amendment applications, lot splits have been pursued, but ultimately rejected.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal. If you have any questions or need any additional information, please let us know.

Respectfully,

Scott Webb, Architect

SITE DESIGN PER SECTION 1145.12

LAND AREA: 43,564 S.F. (1 ACRE)

LAND USE: MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL & PROFESSIONAL OFFICE R1B

RESIDENTIAL DENSITY: 110% OF UNDERLYING ~~R-1A~~ ZONING DISTRICT

R1B ~~R-1A~~ • 15,000 S.F. PER DWELLING UNIT = 2.9 DWELLING UNITS

110% OF 2.9 = 3.2 DWELLING UNITS

(2) OCCUPANTS • (3) DWELLING UNITS • MAX (4) PER DWELLING

DIMENSIONAL REGULATIONS:

BUILDING HEIGHT MAX. 35' (UNDERLYING ZONING DISTRICT)

FRONT SETBACK: 30' (UNDERLYING ZONING DISTRICT

REQUIRED PERIMETER SETBACK = 25'

OPEN SPACE:

MIN 20% OF LOT NOT INCLUDING SETBACK AREAS

4,740 OPEN SPACE AREA #1

4,474 OPEN SPACE ARE #2

9,214 S.F. = 21.1%

LOT COVERAGE:

MAX. 25% ENCLOSED BUILDINGS

3,491 S.F. EXISTING RESIDENCE

530 S.F. EXISTING ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

4,021 S.F. = 9.25%

MAX. 35% LOT TOTAL

4,021 S.F. = ENCLOSED BUILDINGS

5,397 S.F. = DRIVES, SIDEWALKS & PATIOS

9,418 S.F. = 21.62% EXISTING

+ 810 S.F. = FUTURE COMMERCIAL PARKING

+ 442 S.F. = FUTURE RESIDENTIAL PARKING

10,670 S.F. = 24.49% TOTAL

ENVIRONMENTAL:

100' NATURAL BUFFER FROM NATURAL SURFACE WATER - N/A

LANDSCAPING & SCREENING:

EXISTING MATURE TREES EXCEEDS MINIMUMS OF THE ZONING CODE

ACCESS & MOBILITY:

DIRECT ACCESS FROM COLLECTOR OR ARTERIAL ROAD

PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY PROVIDED BY EXISTING SIDEWALKS

UTILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE:

NO CHANGE TO EXISTING UTILITIES OR INFRASTRUCTURE



SITE PLAN

1" = 30'-0"

ALL STRUCTURES, DRIVES, WALKS & LANDSCAPING ARE EXISTING UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE

STATE OF OHIO
L. SCOTT WEBB
11193
REGISTERED ARCHITECT

SCOTT WEBB
ARCHITECT
103 West Walnut Street
Oxford, Ohio 45056
(513) 523-3838
www.scottwebbarchitect.com

PROPOSED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

5990 Contreras Road

OXFORD, OHIO 45056

Peter & Constance McCarthy

DATE

August 28, 2015

REVISIONS

A-1

Existing Structures

Rear of existing structure

Existing Attached Garage

Existing Privacy Fence along Jacqueline Drive

Neighboring Properties

Existing R-3 Development across Jaqueline Drive

Current Lodging House – Future PUD

Existing Single Family across Contreras Road

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Finance
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: 11/3/2015

Joe Newlin
Prepared by

Account Code No. #: N/A

Budgeted Amount:

10/27/2015
Date Prepared

Agenda Title: 2016 ANNUAL BUDGET ORDINANCE

Recommendation: Approve

Discussion:

Description of 2016 Budget

The current piece of legislation is a reflection of the information presented to Council at its October 8th work session.

Highlights: 2% COLA for all fulltime employees

Capital Improvement & Equipment Spending $3,269,344

- An additional $30,000 transfer to the OAT Improvement Fund

Water Capital Improvement & Equipment Spending $460,778

Waste Water Capital Improvement & Equipment Spending $251,778

Decreased revenue Refuse Fund 341 by $120,000 due to reduced overhead cost associated with Landfill Closure Bond being retired.

- $12,862 in personnel cost added for daily policing of sidewalks and alleys in the Uptown area.

- $17,100 added for sidewalk & trash bin cleaning.

2% increase in Water & Sewer rates

- In the Employee Benefit Fund (tracks City's self-insured medical plan)Increase in City's contribution for medical insurance from $1,011 to $1,198 per employee per month as well as an increase in employee's monthly contribution. This was done to balance revenues to meet

anticipated expenses for 2016.

See additional 13 pages for the high level overview of how the changes affect the major budget categories as presented at the work session.

Approved By:		Initial	Date
	Department Head:		10/27/15
	City Manager:		10/30/15

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE TO MAKE APPROPRIATIONS FOR CURRENT EXPENSES AND OTHER EXPENDITURES OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, STATE OF OHIO, DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2016.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: To provide for the current expenses and expenditures of the City of Oxford during the fiscal year ending December 31, 2016, the following sums be and they are hereby set aside and appropriated as follows:

GENERAL FUND 110

SECURITY OF PERSONS & PROPERTY	
Personnel Services	4,326,798
Other Services & Charges	612,975
Total Appropriation	4,939,773
PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Personnel Services	-
Other Services & Charges	122,664
Total Appropriation	122,664
LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES	
Personnel Services	1,022,070
Other Services & Charges	429,527
Total Appropriation	1,451,597
COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT	
Personnel Services	538,106
Other Services & Charges	346,986
Total Appropriation	885,092
GENERAL GOVERNMENT	
Personnel Services	989,267
Other Services & Charges	847,634
Total Appropriation	1,836,901
TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS	
Personnel Services	-
Other Services & Charges	1,595,873
Total Appropriation	1,595,873
ADVANCES TO OTHER FUNDS	
Personnel Services	-
Other Services & Charges	668,000
Total Appropriation	668,000
TOTAL GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS	11,499,900

FIRE/EMS FUND 418	
Personnel Services	1,144,981
Other Services & Charges	549,568
TOTAL FIRE/EMS FUND APPROPRIATIONS	1,694,549
STREET FUND 122	
Personnel Services	664,835
Other Services & Charges	207,296
TOTAL STREET FUND APPROPRIATIONS	872,131
STATE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT FUND 123	
Other Services & Charges	20,200
TOTAL STATE HIGWAY IMPROVEMENT FUND APPROPRIATIONS	20,200
PARKING FUND 130	
Personnel Services	380,791
Other Services & Charges	100,080
Transfer to Other Funds	195,614
TOTAL PARKING FUND APPROPRIATIONS	676,485
PARKING IMPROVEMENT FUND 142	
Other Services & Charges	32,000
TOTAL PARKING IMPROVEMENT FUND APPROPRIATIONS	32,000
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS	
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUND 126	
Other Services & Charges	119,000
Total Appropriations	119,000
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT LOAN FUND 128	
Other Services & Charges	160,000
Total Appropriations	160,000
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND 140	
Other Services & Charges	256,544
Total Appropriations	256,544
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 141	
Other Services & Charges	505,000
Advance to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	505,000
MUNICIPAL FACILITIES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 140	
Other Services & Charges	1,557,800
Total Appropriations	1,557,800
OAT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 144	
Other Services & Charges	30,000
Advance to Other Funds	668,000
Total Appropriations	698,000

TOTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND APPROPRIATIONS	3,296,344
WATER FUNDS	
WATER (OPERATING) FUND 321	
Personal Services	1,328,322
Other Services & Charges	640,706
Transfers to Other Funds	683,522
Total Appropriations	2,652,550
WATER IMPROVEMENT FUND 322	
Other Services & Charges	355,000
Total Appropriations	355,000
WATER CAPACITY FUND – NE 381	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WATER CAPACITY FUND – NW 382	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WATER CAPACITY FUND – SE 383	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WATER CAPACITY FUND – SW 384	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WATER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND 320	
Other Services & Charges	105,778
Total Appropriations	105,778
TOTAL WATER FUNDS APPROPRIATIONS	3,113,328
WASTEWATER FUNDS	
WASTEWATER (OPERATING) FUND 331	
Personal Services	1,503,528
Other Services & Charges	1,357,631
Transfers to Other Funds	410,001
Total Appropriations	3,271,160
WASTEWATER IMPROVEMENT FUND 332	
Other Services & Charges	140,000
Total Appropriations	140,000

WASTEWATER CAPACITY FUND – NE 391	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WASTEWATER CAPACITY FUND – NW 392	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WASTEWATER CAPACITY FUND – SE 393	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WASTEWATER CAPACITY FUND – SW 394	
Other Services & Charges	-
Transfers to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	-
WASTEWATER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND 330	
Other Services & Charges	111,778
Total Appropriations	111,778
TOTAL WASTEWATER FUNDS APPROPRIATIONS	3,522,938
STORM WATER FUND 351	
Personal Services	-
Other Services & Charges	40,000
TOTAL STORM WATER FUND APPROPRIATIONS	40,000
RUFUSE FUNDS	
REFUSE (OPERATING) FUND 341	
Personal Services	178,717
Other Services & Charges	1,382,706
Transfer to Other Funds	30,001
Total Appropriations	1,591,424
LANDFILL POST-CLOSURE INVESTMENT FUND 353	
Other Services & Charges	1,200
Transfer to Other Funds	-
Total Appropriations	1,200
TOTAL REFUSE FUNDS APPROPRIATIONS	1,592,624
HOTEL & CONVENTION TAX FUND 120	
Other Services & Charges	204,920
Transfer to Other Funds	13,080
TOTAL HOTEL & CONVENTION TAX FUND APPROPRIATIONS	218,000

LIFE SQUAD GIFT FUND 210	
Other Services & Charges	-
TOTAL LIFE SQUAD GIFT FUND APPROPRIATIONS	-
AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND 212	
Other Services & Charges	-
TOTAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND APPROPRIATIONS	-
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FUND 230	
Other Services & Charges	1,819,595
TOTAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FUND APPROPRIATIONS	1,819,595
INTERNAL SERVICE FUND 370	
Other Services & Charges	277,509
TOTAL INTERNAL SERVICE FUND APPROPRIATIONS	277,509
LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST FUND 410	
Personnel Services	-
Other Services & Charges	12,000
TOTAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST FUND APPROPRIATIONS	12,000
ENFORCEMENT & EDUCATION FUND 412	
Personnel Services	-
Other Services & Charges	34,773
TOTAL ENFORCEMENT & EDUCATION FUND APPROPRIATIONS	34,773
BOARD OF BUILDING STANDARDS FUND 414	
Other Services & Charges	2,850
TOTAL BOARD OF BLD STANDARDS FUND APPROPRIATIONS	2,850
FEMA FUND 416	
Personnel Services	-
Other Services & Charges	-
Advance to Other Funds	-
TOTAL FEMA FUND APPROPRIATIONS	-
SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FUND 417	
Other Services & Charges	50,000
TOTAL SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FUND APPROPRIATIONS	50,000
OVI TASK FORCE FUND 419	
Personnel Services	56,082
Other Services & Charges	168,327
TOTAL OVI TASK FORCE FUND APPROPRIATIONS	224,409
DEBT SERVICE FUNDS	
1999 PARKS IMPROVEMENT BOND FUND 152	
Other Services & Charges	310,850
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE FUND APPROPRIATIONS	310,850

TOTAL 2016 BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS 29,310,485

SECTION 2: The City Auditor (Finance Director) is here by authorized to draw warrants upon the Treasury from the amounts appropriated in this ordinance whenever claims are made, with the approval of the City Manager, where appropriate, and are legally contracted for in accordance with the law.

SECTION 3: This Ordinance shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____

MAYOR

ADOPTED: _____

ATTEST:

_____

CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: STAFF

General Fund

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	10,679,802	10,679,802	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	9,098,412	9,236,027	137,615
NET OPERATIONS	1,581,390	1,443,775	(137,615)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	0
TRANSFERS IN	150,127	152,098	1,971
TRANSFERS OUT	(1,682,602)	(1,595,873)	86,729
ADVANCES IN	668,000	668,000	0
ADVANCES OUT	(668,000)	(668,000)	0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	48,915	0	(222,373)
BEG FUND BALANCE	7,525,888	7,525,888	
ENCUMBRANCE			
ENDING FUND BALANCE	7,574,803	7,525,888	
Expenditures			
Fringe Benefits (Medical) - All Departments	140,946		
Police Ed. Reimbursement - Human Resources	(3,331)		
Total Expenditures	137,615		
Transfers In			
From Parking Fund	687		
From Water Fund	428		
From Sewer Fund	428		
From Refuse Fund	428		
Total Transfers In	1,971		
Transfers Out			
Transfer to Street Fund	17,381		
Transfer to Capital Equipment Fund	(134,110)		
Transfer to OAT Fund	30,000		
Total Transfers Out	(86,729)		

Fire & EMS Fund

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	1,644,588	1,644,588	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,535,809	1,546,489	10,680
NET OPERATIONS	108,779	98,099	(10,680)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(148,060)	(148,060)	0
TRANSFERS IN	18,150	18,150	0
TRANSFERS OUT	0	0	0
ADVANCES IN	0	0	0
ADVANCES OUT	0	0	0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	(21,131)	(31,811)	(10,680)
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	1,628,689	1,628,689	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	1,607,558	1,596,878	

Expenditures

Fringe Benefits (Medical)	10,680

Street & State Highway Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	337,224	337,224	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	874,282	892,331	18,049
NET OPERATIONS	(537,058)	(555,107)	(18,049)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	0
TRANSFERS IN	537,154	555,203	18,049
TRANSFERS OUT	0	0	0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	96	96	0
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	199,102	199,102	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	199,198	199,198	
Expenditures			
Fringe Benefits (Medical)	18,049		
Transfers In			
From General Fund	17,381		
From Parking Fund	668		
Total Transfers In	18,049		

Parking & Parking Improvements Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	692,938	692,938	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	474,783	480,871	6,088
NET OPERATIONS	218,155	212,067	(6,088)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(32,000)	(32,000)	0
TRANSFERS IN	32,000	32,000	0
TRANSFERS OUT	(194,259)	(195,614)	(1,355)
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	23,896	16,453	(7,443)
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	742,808	742,808	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	766,704	759,261	
Expenditures			
Fringe Benefits (Medical)	6,088		
Transfers Out			
To General Fund	687		
To Street Fund	668		
Total Transfers Out	1,355		

Capital Project Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	858,484	858,484	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	0	0	0
NET OPERATIONS	858,484	858,484	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(2,598,344)	(2,628,344)	(30,000)
TRANSFERS IN	880,379	776,269	(104,110)
TRANSFERS OUT	0	0	0
ADVANCES IN	668,000	668,000	0
ADVANCES OUT	(668,000)	(668,000)	0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	(859,481)	(993,591)	(74,110)
BEG FUND BALANCE	3,352,535	3,352,535	
ENCUMBRANCE	0	0	
ENDING FUND BALANCE	2,493,054	2,358,944	
Capital Improvements			
OAT Improvements	30,000		
Transfers In			
From General Fund - OAT Improvements	30,000		
From General Fund - Capital Equipment	(134,110)		
Total Transfers In	(104,110)		

Water Operating & Improvement Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	3,287,970	3,287,970	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,937,475	1,969,028	31,553
NET OPERATIONS	1,350,495	1,318,942	(31,553)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(460,778)	(460,778)	0
TRANSFERS IN	643,521	643,521	0
TRANSFERS OUT	(683,094)	(683,522)	(428)
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	850,144	818,163	(31,981)
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	3,699,811	3,699,811	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	4,549,955	4,517,974	
Expenditures			
Fringe Benefits (Medical) - All Departments	31,533		
Transfers Out			
To General Fund	428		

Wastewater Operating & Improvement Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	2,985,528	2,985,528	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,821,062	2,861,159	40,097
NET OPERATIONS	164,466	124,369	(40,097)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(251,778)	(251,778)	0
TRANSFERS IN	370,000	370,000	0
TRANSFERS OUT	(409,573)	(410,001)	(428)
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	(126,885)	(167,410)	(40,525)
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	4,065,287	4,065,287	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	3,938,402	3,897,877	
Expenditures			
Fringe Benefits (Medical) - All Departments	40,097		
Transfers Out			
To General Fund	428		

Storm Water Operating Fund

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	397	397	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	40,000	40,000	0
NET OPERATIONS	(39,603)	(39,603)	0
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	0
TRANSFERS IN	40,000	40,000	0
TRANSFERS OUT	0	0	0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	397	397	0
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	20,391	20,391	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	20,788	20,788	

Refuse Operating and Landfill Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	1,568,683	1,568,683	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,478,709	1,512,623	33,914
NET OPERATIONS	89,974	56,060	(33,914)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(50,000)	(50,000)	0
TRANSFERS IN	0	0	0
TRANSFERS OUT	(29,573)	(30,001)	(428)
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	10,401	(23,941)	(34,342)
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	2,875,201	2,875,201	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	2,885,602	2,851,260	
Expenditures			
Fringe Benefits (Medical) - All Departments	3,952		
1,090 Hrs. Part-Time employee for daily policing of sidewalks and alleys in Uptown Area	12,862		
Sidewalk & Trash Bin Cleaning	17,100		
Total Expenditures	33,914		
Transfers Out			
To General Fund	428		

Other Miscellaneous Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	2,182,637	2,585,685	403,048
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,140,614	2,543,283	402,669
NET OPERATIONS	42,023	42,402	379
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(82,773)	(82,773)	0
TRANSFERS IN	30,000	30,000	0
TRANSFERS OUT	(13,080)	(13,080)	0
ADVANCES IN	0	0	0
ADVANCES OUT	0	0	0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	(23,830)	(23,451)	379
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	704,326	704,326	
ENCUMBERED			
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	680,496	680,875	

Revenues

Employee Benefit Fund	
Premiums - City Contribution	150,696
Employee Contribution	15,368
Flexible Spending Contribution	12,575
Total Employee Benefit Fund	178,639
OVI Task Force Fund	224,409
OVI Grant	
Total Revenues	403,048

Expenditures

Employee Benefit Fund	
Prescription Claims	25,399
Vision Claims Employees	146
Medical Claims Dependents	113,311
Employee Assistance Program	333
Administrative Fees	26,496
Employee Flexible Spending	12,575
Total Employee Benefit Fund	178,260
OVI Task Force Fund	
Personnel Services	56,082
Operating Expenses	168,327
Total OVI Task Force Fund	224,409
Expenditures	402,669

Debt Service Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	310,850	310,850	0
NET OPERATIONS	(310,850)	(310,850)	0
TRANSFERS IN	310,850	310,850	0
TRANSFERS OUT	0	0	
			0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	0	0	0
BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	0	0	0
BALANCE AT END OF YEAR	0	0	

All Funds

	2016 Work Session Budget	2016 Current Budget	Delta
TOTAL RECEIPTS	24,238,251	24,641,299	403,048
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	20,711,996	21,392,661	680,665
NET OPERATIONS	3,526,255	3,248,638	(277,617)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	(3,623,733)	(3,653,733)	(30,000)
TRANSFERS IN	3,012,181	2,928,091	(84,090)
TRANSFERS OUT	(3,012,181)	(2,928,091)	84,090
ADVANCES IN	668,000	668,000	0
ADVANCES OUT	668,000	668,000	0
NET INCOME (DEFICIT)	(97,478)	(405,095)	(415,797)
BEG FUND BALANCE	24,814,038	24,814,038	
ENCUMBRANCE	0	0	
ENDING FUND BALANCE	24,716,560	24,408,943	
Revenues			
Premiums - City Contribution	150,696		
Employee Contribution	15,368		
Flexible Spending Contribution	12,575		
OVI Task Force Grant	224,409		
Total Revenues	403,048		
Expenditures			
Fringe Benefits (Medical)	251,345		
Police Ed. Reimbursement - Human Resources	(3,331)		
1,090 Hrs. Part-Time employee for daily policing of sidewalks and alleys in Uptown Area	12,862		
Sidewalk & Trash Bin Cleaning	17,100		
Prescription Claims	25,399		
Vision Claims Employees	146		
Medical Claims Dependents	113,311		
Employee Assistance Program	333		

All Funds

Administrative Fees	**26,496**
Employee Flexible Spending	**12,575**
OVI Personnel Services	**56,082**
OVI Operating Expenses	**168,327**
Total Expenditures	**680,645**
Transfers In	
From Parking - General	**687**
From Water - General	**428**
From Sewer - General	**428**
From Refuse - General	**428**
From General - Street	**18,049**
From General - OAT Improvements	**30,000**
From General - Capital Equipment	**(134,110)**
Total Transfers In	**(84,090)**
Transfers Out	
Transfer to Street - General	**17,381**
Transfer to Capital Equipment - General	**(134,110)**
Transfer to OAT - General	**30,000**
To General Fund - Street	**687**
To Street Fund - Street	**668**
To General Fund - Water	**428**
To General Fund - Sewer	**428**
To General Fund - Refuse	**428**
Total Transfers Out	**(84,090)**

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Finance
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: 11/3/2015

Joe Newlin
Prepared by

Account Code No. #: N/A

Budgeted Amount:

10/26/2015
Date Prepared

Agenda Title: 2016 ANNUAL TRANSFER ORDINANCE

Recommendation: Approve

Discussion:

Description of Budgeted Transfers for the 2016 Budget

Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to STREET FUND 122	530,604.00
Annual General Fund Financial Support (quarterly)	
Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 141	385,000.00
Annual General Fund Financial Support (quarterly)	
Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to PARKS IMPROVEMENT BOND DEBT SERVICE FUND 152	310,850.00
Annual General Fund Debt Service Payment (bi-annual to match debt payment)	
Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND 140	251,269.00
Annual General Fund Financial Support (quarterly)	
Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to STORM WATER FUND 351	40,000.00
General Fund Financial Support (1st quarter)	
Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FUND 417	30,000.00

General Fund Financial Support (1st quarter)	
Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to OAT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 144	30,000.00
General Fund Financial Support (1st quarter)	
Transfer from GENERAL FUND 110 Transfer to FIRE/EMS FUND 418	18,150.00
Annual General Fund Financial Support (quarterly)	
Transfer from PARKING FUND 130 Transfer to CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 141	110,000.00
Annual Parking Fund Loan Repayment (quarterly)	
Transfer from PARKING FUND 130 Transfer to PARKING IMPROVEMENT FUND 142	32,000.00
Annual Parking Fund Financial Support (1st quarter)	
Transfer from PARKING FUND 130 Transfer to GENERAL FUND 110	29,015.00
Annual Parking Fund Payment for Service department support (quarterly)	
Transfer from PARKING FUND 130 Transfer to STREET FUND 122	24,599.00
Annual Parking Fund Financial Support for work performed (quarterly)	
Transfer from WATER FUND 321 Transfer to WATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 322	518,043.00
Annual Water Fund Financial Support (1st quarter)	
Transfer from WATER FUND 321 Transfer to WATER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND 320	125,478.00
Annual Water Fund Financial Support (quarterly)	
Transfer from WATER FUND 321 Transfer to GENERAL FUND 110	40,001.00
Annual Water Fund Financial Support – Mowing & Muni-Building Expenses (quarterly)	
Transfer from WASTEWATER FUND 331 Transfer to WASTEWATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 332	200,000.00
Annual Wastewater Fund Financial Support (1st quarter)	
Transfer from WASTEWATER FUND 331 Transfer to WASTEWATER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND 330	170,000.00
Annual Wastewater Fund Financial Support (quarterly)	

Transfer from WASTEWATER FUND 331
Transfer to GENERAL FUND 110 40,001.00

Annual Wastewater Fund Financial Support – Mowing & Muni-Building Expenses (quarterly)

Transfer from REFUSE FUND 341
Transfer to GENERAL FUND 110 30,001.00

Annual Refuse Fund Financial Support – Muni-Building Expenses (quarterly)

Transfer from HOTEL TAX FUND 120
Transfer to GENERAL FUND 110 13,080.00

Annual Hotel Tax Fund Financial Support (monthly)

Approved By: **Initial Date**

Department Head: 10/26/15

City Manager: 10/30/15

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE OUTLINING BUDGETED TRANSFERS FOR THE CITY OF OXFORD, STATE OF OHIO, DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2016.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY,
STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The following transfers are to be executed for the City of Oxford during the fiscal year ending December 31, 2016, as follows:

Transfer from:

General Fund 110	530,604.00
General Fund 110	385,000.00
General Fund 110	310,850.00
General Fund 110	251,269.00
General Fund 110	40,000.00
General Fund 110	30,000.00
General Fund 110	30,000.00
General Fund 110	18,150.00
Parking Fund 130	110,000.00
Parking Fund 130	32,000.00
Parking Fund 130	29,015.00
Parking Fund 130	24,599.00
Water Fund 321	518,043.00
Water Fund 321	125,478.00
Water Fund 321	40,001.00
Wastewater Fund 331	200,000.00
Wastewater Fund 331	170,000.00
Wastewater Fund 331	40,001.00
Refuse Fund 341	30,001.00
Hotel Tax Fund 120	13,080.00

Transfer to:

Street Fund 122	530,604.00
Capital Improvement Fund 141	385,000.00
Parks Improvements Bond Debt Service Fund 152	310,850.00
Capital Equipment Fund 140	251,269.00
Storm Water Fund 351	40,000.00
Special Assessment Fund 417	30,000.00
OAT Capital Improvement Fund 144	30,000.00
Fire/EMS Fund 418	18,150.00
Capital Improvement Fund 141	110,000.00
Parking Improvement Fund 142	32,000.00
General Fund 110	29,015.00
Street Fund 122	24,599.00
Water Capital Improvement Fund 322	518,043.00
Water Capital Equipment Fund 320	125,478.00

General Fund 110	40,001.00
Wastewater Improvement Fund 332	200,000.00
Wastewater Capital Equipment Fund 330	170,000.00
General Fund 110	40,001.00
General Fund 110	30,001.00
General Fund 110	13,080.00

SECTION 2: This Ordinance shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____

MAYOR

ADOPTED: _____

ATTEST:

_____

CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: STAFF

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Finance
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: 11/3/2015

Joe Newlin
Prepared by

Account Code No. #: N/A

Budgeted Amount:

10/26/2015
Date Prepared

Agenda Title: **2016 ANNUAL ADVANCE ORDINANCE**

Recommendation: **Approve**

Discussion:

Description of Budgeted Advances for the 2016 Budget

Advance from GENERAL FUND 110
Advance to OAT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND 144
- Phase I OAT construction

Funds to be reimbursed from ODNR - Clean Ohio Trail Fund & Donations	668,000.00

This repayment to General Fund will be made when funds received.

Approved By:

	Initial	Date
Department Head:		10/26/15
City Manager:		10/30/15

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE OUTLINING BUDGETED ADVANCES FOR THE CITY OF OXFORD, STATE OF OHIO, DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2016.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY,
STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The following advances are to be executed for the City of Oxford during the fiscal year ending December 31, 2016, as follows:

Advance from:

General Fund 110	668,000.00
OAT Capital Improvement Fund 144	668,000.00

Advance to:

OAT Capital Improvement Fund 144	668,000.00
General Fund 110	668,000.00

SECTION 2: This Ordinance shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED: _____

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: STAFF

CITY OF OXFORD
STAFF SUMMARY REPORT

Report to the City Manager

Finance
Originating Department

Council Meeting Of: 11/03/15

Account Code No. #: NA

Heidi Hill
Prepared By

Budgeted Amount: NA

10/28/15
Date Prepared

Agenda Title: 2016 Fee Ordinance

Recommendation: Approve

Discussion:

Additions, changes, or deletions in the ordinance are shown as follows:

- Additions are in bold
- Deletions are in strikeout type
- Fees not changed are in normal type

Any questions regarding fee changes should be directed to the respective department head.

Approved By:

Initial Date

Department Head: 10/28/15

City Manager: 10/30/15

ORDINANCE NO.

ORDINANCE ADOPTING FEES AND CHARGES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXFORD, BUTLER COUNTY, STATE OF OHIO, THAT:

SECTION 1: The City Manager recommends City Council adopt fees for 2016 as itemized below.

A. RECREATION DEPARTMENT (Residents living in the City of Oxford)

1) FITNESS	$ Amount Residents	$ Amount Non-residents
Drop-in-fees	4.50	5.00
Aerobics per class	3.75	4.00

2) WEIGHT ROOM FEES

Adults		
1 Year	100.00	115.00
6 Months	85.00	95.00
3 Months	70.00	80.00
1 Month	30.00	35.00
Drop-ins	5.00	5.50
High School		
1 Year	70.00	77.00
6 Months	60.00	66.00
3 Months	45.00	50.00
1 Month	25.00	30.00
Drop-ins	5.00	6.00

3) PRESCHOOL (per week)

Mon/Wed/Fri	35.00	39.00
Tues/Thurs	25.00	29.00

5) PLAYGROUND/SUMMER DAY CAMPS 10 WKS.

Daily	30.00	33.00
each additional child in family	27.00	30.00
Weekly	98.00	108.00
each additional child in family	92.00	100.00

Half-day:		
Pre-school camps	65.00	76.00

6) YOUTH SPORTS LEAGUES

Basketball (11 wks)		
Instructional League, Grade K	48.00	53.00
Competitive League, Grade 1-2	62.00	68.00
Competitive League, Grade 3-10	75.00	83.00

7) ADULT SPORTS LEAGUES

Adult softball	400.00	

8) RENTAL FEES

Municipal pool		
Pool rental, per hour (minimum 2 hours)	50.00	55.00
Guard fee, per hour	11.00	13.00
Athletic Field Rental Fees		
Per game, per field (rental)	25.00	30.00
Per game, per field (prep)	30.00	35.00
Per hour, per field (lights)	30.00	35.00
Per day, per field (Rental)	110.00	175.00
Community Park Gazebo Rental 4 hrs	30.00	33.00
5+hrs	60.00	65.00
Park Shelter Rental 4 hrs	25.00	30.00
5+ hrs	50.00	55.00
Electric Tap Fee	50.00 per day	
Large machines such as ice machine Inflatable's, etc.)		

9) MUNICIPAL POOL

Season pool passes		
Family (5 or less)	135.00	150.00
10.00 each additional	11.00 each additional	
Adult	95.00	105.00
High School	75.00	85.00
Child over 3 years	70.00	80.00
General admission		
Adult	4.25	
Age 13-17	4.00	
Age 3-12	3.25	
2 and under Free		

Swimming lessons

Parent/toddler (6 mo. - 5 yr.)	35.00 38.00
Skill Level I and II	38.00 42.00
Skill Level III thru IV	40.00 44.00

10) SENIOR CITIZEN CENTER RENTAL
(minimum 2 hour rental) 60/hr includes kitchen/great room

Special events and specialty class fees are established to cover the direct cost of each class/activity offered.

B.COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

1) ADMINISTRATIVE ZONING REVIEW

Building Accessory, Minor Improvements	
Residential	~~20.00~~ **50.00**
Commercial	~~25.00~~**100.00**
One or Two-Family Residential	
New home	100.00
Existing	50.00
Three-Family or more Residential	50.00 per unit
Commercial (existing and new)	200.00 per unit
Revision after the 2nd submittal	100.00
Sidewalk Use Permit	50.00
Signs (per sign)	25.00 per sign plus $1 per sq. ft. per side
Face changes of signs	25.00
Zoning verification letter	35.00

2) BOARD OR COMMISSION REVIEW

GENERAL FEES FOR ALL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Significant changes to original application may be subject to new fees as determined by the Community Development Director at a cost not to exceed original application. (Revisions beyond the 3rd submittal, requiring planning or engineering review, will be charged a re-review fee per review.)	30.00
List of property owners for notification purposes	30.00

PLANNING COMMISSION

Conditional Use Permits	400.00 plus actual postage
~~Alternate Landscaping Plan~~	~~25.00~~
Annexation	
100% owner petition	300.00 plus 1.00 per acre
Conceptual Review	No fee

Lot Changes	
Subdivision Development	
Preliminary	400.00 plus 10.00 per lot, plus actual postage
Final	400.00 plus 10.00 per lot, plus actual postage
Planned Development	
Preliminary	400.00 plus 100.00 per acre, plus actual postage
Final	400.00 plus 100.00 per acre, plus actual postage
Minor Amendment	50.00
Lot Consolidation	20.00
Lot Split	20.00
Zoning Amendments	
Code (per topic)	150.00, plus actual postage
Map	150.00, plus actual postage
All other for Planning Commission	
Review at public meeting only	25.00
Requiring one or more legal notices	100.00
HISTORIC & ARCHITECTUAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION	
Certificate of Appropriateness	30.00
Sketch Review	No fee
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS	
Variance Petition	200.00 plus 100.00 for each additional variance request up to a maximum of 1,000.00 plus actual postage
Appeal of Administrator's Decision	50.00
Appeal of HAPC Decision	100.00
3) DOCUMENTS, MAPS, & OTHER MATERIALS	At Cost

C. INSPECTIONS

1) One, Two, and Three-Family Dwellings and Accessory Buildings (~~OBOA~~ - **Residential Code of Ohio -** Ohio Building Officials Association)

a. New Construction	
Building	~~50.00~~ **80.00** plus ~~20.00~~ **30.00** per 100 square feet of gross floor area
Mechanical	~~25.00~~ **50.00** plus 4.00 per 100 square feet of gross floor area.
Electrical	~~25.00~~ **50.00** plus 4.00 per 100 square feet of gross floor area.
Third and subsequent plan review	~~40.00~~ **60.00** per hour

b. Miscellaneous

Accessory Buildings	~~20.00~~ **30.00** plus ~~.50~~ **1.00** per 10 square foot over 200 square feet
Furnace installation/replacement	~~30.00~~ **50.00 per unit**
Central air condition installation/ replacement	~~30.00~~ **50.00 per unit**
Combination furnace/central air Installation/replacement	~~60.00~~ **100.00**
Minor Electric	~~30.00~~ **45.00**
Demolition	50.00
Alterations/Remodeling/Fire Repair	~~100.00~~ **80.00** plus ~~20.00~~ **30.00** per 100 sq. ft.
Partial permits (where granted)	50.00
Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	~~40.00~~ **100.00**
Certificate of Occupancy	**50.00**
Re-Inspection	**60.00**
(Charge for the third and subsequent inspection each time for the same permit)	
Swimming Pool **> 24" deep**	**90.00**
~~In-ground~~	~~90.00~~
~~Above ground~~	~~40.00~~
Temporary Pole	**50.00**
Residential Code of Ohio Surcharge	**Applicants covered by this Code will be assessed an additional 1% surcharge fee as mandated by Ohio Administrative Code Section**

2. Commercial ~~and Residential~~ Buildings (Ohio ~~Basic~~ Building Code)
Commercial and residential

a. New Construction

Building	~~120.00~~ **100.00** plus ~~10.00~~ **20.00** per 100 square feet of gross floor area, including accessory buildings
Mechanical	100.00 plus 5.00 per 100 square feet of gross floor area, including accessory buildings
Electrical	100.00 plus 5.00 per 100 square feet of gross floor area, including accessory buildings
Alterations/Remodeling/Fire Repair	~~80.00~~ **100.00** plus ~~6.00~~ **10.00** per 100 square feet
Fire Suppression Systems	~~100.00~~ **150.00** plus 5.00 per 100 square feet of gross floor area.
Hood Suppression Systems	~~100.00~~ **150.00**
Hood System	~~80.00~~ **150.00**
Fire Alarm System	~~100.00~~ **150.00** plus 1.00 per 100 square feet of gross floor area
Minor Electric	80.00
Third and subsequent plan review	~~75.00~~ **100.00** per hour

b. Miscellaneous

Demolition	80.00
Furnace/AC Replacement, including roof top units	~~80.00~~ **150.00 each**

Partial Permit (where granted)	100.00
Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	~~80.00~~ 250.00
Certificate of Use and Occupancy	**250.00**
Reinspection Fee	**100.00**
(Charge for the third and subsequent inspection each time for the same permit)	
~~OBBC~~ **OBC** Surcharge Applications covered by the ~~OBBC~~ **OBC** will be assessed an additional 3% surcharge fee as mandated by Ohio Administrative Code Section 4101:2-1-50(b).	

3. Other Fees

(Applies to ~~both~~ ~~OBOA~~ ~~Residential Code of Ohio and~~ ~~OBBC~~ **OBC** buildings unless otherwise noted.)

Moving or relocating buildings	250.00
Building Permit Renewal	50.00
Electric Service Upgrade	~~35.00~~ 80.00
Temporary Pole	~~30.00~~ 80.00
Change of Building Plans (after approval)	50.00 plus cost of plan review (~~40.00~~ 60.00 for residential, ~~75.00~~ 100.00 for commercial per hour) when building plans are revised after issuance of permit.
Fuel Storage Tank (per tank)	~~25.00~~ 75.00
Sidewalk-Curb-Gutter Permit	25.00
Temporary structures, including tents	**75.00 plus 0.50 per sq. ft.**
Awnings ~~-tents~~	~~25.00~~ 75.00
Signs	~~50.00~~ 100.00 **plus 0.40 per sq. ft.**
Fences	~~20.00~~ 40.00
~~Reinspection Fee~~	~~30.00~~
~~(Charge for the third and subsequent inspection each time for the same permit)~~	
Backflow Prevention Permit	25.00
Work without a permit ~~(Starting construction without a permit)~~	Greater of $200.00 or twice the cost of the permit fee
Gas Line (per meter)	~~30.00~~ 75.00
4. Removal of structure prior to receipt of Certificate of Appropriateness	50% of estimated demolition cost for each day after notification until a plan for reuse of property and a bond is filed.

5. Rental Housing Permits

Initial Establishment (or if inactive for 2 years or more)	
First unit	110.00
Each additional unit	30.00
Fraternity	330.00 for first 50 persons, 15.00 for each additional person

Invalid rental permit: The rental permit shall be invalid if the permit has not been renewed for over one year after the expiration date or the subject property has not been inspected for over 24 months, unless an active building permit is in progress.

Late Fee	10.00 after ~~60~~ **30** days expired.
	20.00 after ~~120~~ **60** days expired.
	30.00 after ~~180~~ **90** days expired.
Annual Renewal & Ownership Transfer	
First unit	55.00
Each additional unit	30.00
Rooming house or lodging house	110.00
Fraternity	330.00 for first 50 persons,
	15.00 for each additional person

Re-inspection (charge for a second site visit to re-inspection and each subsequent re-inspection. This charge also applies to additional site visits due to "no show" by agent/owner/designee)

First unit	75.00
Each additional unit	10.00
Rooming house or lodging house	75.00
Fraternity	75.00

Board of Appeal Application	150.00

D. POLICE DEPARTMENT

Events requiring Officers for Crowd or Traffic Control:

One Officer	35.00 per hour
Each additional Officer	35.00 per hour
Police Supervisor	45.00 per hour
(Required for each four Police Officers)	
Police Command Officer	55.00 per hour
(Required for two squads of five Officers)	

Per arrestee processed and transported to Butler County Jail by Oxford Police Department on City of Oxford criminal charges 200.00

Subsequent per diem for inmates incarcerated in Butler County Jail on City of Oxford criminal charges 100.00

Fingerprinting	15.00
Records Checks	15.00

Alarm User Permit Fees	
New Residential	20.00 annually
New Commercial/Industrial	25.00 annually
Renewal	10.00 annually
False Alarm Fees	
Residential, Commercial & Industrial	
1 to 2 Annually	No charge
Residential	
3 or more	50.00 per occurrence

Commercial/Industrial	
3 to 4 Annually	50.00 per occurrence
5 to 6 Annually	100.00 per occurrence
7 to 8 Annually	200.00 per occurrence
9 or more	400.00 per occurrence
Accident, crime, other reports	.10 per page
Purchase Meter time, Fee for Special Event (Meter Bags)	10.00 per meter per day
Purchase Meter time, Fee for Construction (Meter Bags)	10.00 per meter per day
Signs: "No Parking by Order of the Oxford P.D."	0.35 per sign
Impound/Immobilization Fees	100.00 1st offense 200.00 2nd offense 300.00 3rd and all subsequent for the first day or any part thereof 12.00 each subsequent day or any part thereof 20.00 each subsequent day or any part thereof for vehicles covered or stored within a building
Towing Charges	100.00 1st offense 200.00 2nd offense 300.00 3rd offense plus any additional charges for services requiring specialized equipment or extra personnel
Administrative Citation Hearing Fee	20.00 per appeal (lost appeal only)
Administrative Citation Collection Fee	27% of unpaid fine
Animal Boarding	21.50 1st day or any part thereof 13.50 each subsequent day or any part thereof
Parking	
Short Term Meters	0.25 per 20 minutes
High Density Parking Areas	0.50 per hour
Street side hourly meters	0.25 per hour
Parking garage meters	0.50 per hour
10 hour meters	0.50 for two hours
Monthly garage lease	~~475.00~~ **525.00** biannually ~~900.00~~ **1000.00** annually
Residential Permitted Parking	25.00 annually
Parking Collection Fees	
Retrieval of vehicle record	1.95 per look up
Citations collection fee	27% of unpaid fine

~~Alcohol Education Program Admin Fee 350.00~~
~~Alcohol Education Instructional Fee 125.00~~

E. FIRE/EMS DEPARTMENT

EMS Runs	BLS-E	~~610.00~~ **620.00** per run
	ALS-1 E	~~882.00~~ **890.00** per run
	ALS-2 E	~~1097.00~~ **1110.00** per run
EMS Mileage Rate		~~16.00~~ **17.00** per loaded mile

Court ordered restitution for Transport refusal	300.00
Fire Watch	35.00 per hour per person Two hour minimum
EMS Stand-By	35.00 per hour per person Two hour minimum
Civil Citation Hearing Fee	Actual cost of Hearing Officer (lost appeal only, does not apply on first offense)

F. SERVICE DEPARTMENT

1) Water service

Temporary meter deposit (hydrant connection)	
5/8 Inch	~~500.00~~ **510.00**
2 Inch	~~1600.00~~ **1632.00**
Daily set-up and removal of device	~~100.00~~ **102.00**

Cost of water by volume (temporary meter) ~~3.20~~ **3.25** per 100 cubic feet

Temporary Water Service through an approved meter pit device prior to meter installation:

5/8 x 3/4"	~~64.00~~ **65.00**
1"	~~166.00~~ **169.00**
1 ½"	~~332.00~~ **339.00**
2"	~~536.00~~ **547.00**
3"	~~1,071.00~~ **1092.00**
4"	~~1,670.00~~ **1703.00**
6"	~~3,347.00~~ **3414.00**

Bulk Water Service ~~3.20~~ **3.25** per 100 cubic feet; requires new account fee for service. Sanitary fees in effect for water entering the sanitary system. Service available under authority of Service Director or his/her designee.

Account Initiation Fee		50.00 (50% Water, 50% Sewer)
Water rates		
Volume charge per 100 cu feet		~~2.37~~ **2.40**
Base monthly charge Meter size (inch):	3/4 or smaller	~~8.64~~ **8.80**
	1	~~14.39~~ **14.65**
	1 & ½	~~28.77~~ **29.35**
	2	~~46.05~~ **46.95**
	3	~~86.34~~ **88.05**
	4	~~143.92~~ **146.80**
	6	~~287.83~~ **293.60**
Outside city limits		35% added to amounts above
Late fee		10%
Green Card distribution		5.00 if card leaves office
Gold Card distribution		5.00 charge would be in addition to turn on fee if the service is terminated.
Reconnection fee following service termination		10.00 1st occurrence when past due payment is received before 3:00 PM.
		20.00 2nd occurrence when past due payment is received before 3:00 PM.
		30.00 3rd and subsequent occurrences when past due payment is received before 3:00 PM.
		50.00 after 3:00 PM and for weekends/holidays reconnection
Irrigation meter		At cost to City
Irrigation meter repair		5.00 + costs
"No show" on scheduled appointment		25.00
Tap-in fees		
Based on tap size (inch)	1	~~2,500.00~~ **2550.00**
	2	~~2,845.00~~ **2902.00**
	4	~~3,500.00~~ **3570.00**
	6	~~4,325.00~~ **4412.00**
	8	~~6,525.00~~ **6656.00**
	10	~~8,995.00~~ **9175.00**
	12	~~10,295.00~~ **10501.00**
~~On brick street~~		~~Add 30.00/per sq ft of affected area~~

Outside City Limits	35% added to amounts above
Separate meter pits	time and materials

Meter Vault and Lid (based on meter size)

5/8 & 3/4 (inch) One Included in tap fee; ~~515.00~~ **525.30** each additional (max of four pits per residential tap)

3" and greater installed by the contractor at developer's expense.

Water Meter including RF remote sending unit.

5/8 & 3/4 (inch)	~~330.00~~ **337.00**
1	~~369.00~~ **376.00**
1 & ½	~~1,390.00~~ **1418.00**
2	~~1,750.00~~ **1785.00**
3	~~2,400.00~~ **2448.00**
4	~~3,750.00~~ **3825.00**
Larger than 4	Cost to the City plus 10% administrative fee.

Water Capacity benefit charges

Meter size (inch):

5/8 & 3/4	~~1,550.00~~ **1581.00**
1	~~4,020.00~~ **4100.00**
1 & ½	~~8,090.00~~ **8252.00**
2	~~13,090.00~~ **13352.00**
3	~~26,100.00~~ **26622.00**
4	~~40,700.00~~ **41514.00**
6	~~81,600.00~~ **83232.00**
8	~~130,500.00~~ **133110.00**
10	~~187,900.00~~ **191658.00**

Fifty percent of the required capacity benefit charge will become due for all lots platted at time of recording. The remaining fees will become due with application for a building permit.

Interest rate on past due capacity benefit permits unpaid after 30 days	Highest rate allowable by law
New construction inspection	50.00 (initial inspection) 50.00 (re-inspection of failed work)
New Water Main Chlorination / Disinfection Inspection	150.00
New water main valve operation / And line flushing	150.00
New Water Main Hydrostatic Testing	100.00 per test
New Water Main Bacteria sampling / Testing	150.00 per event (includes laboratory fees)
Water main installation inspection / Outside of normal working hours	City cost for inspection expense

Fire Hydrant Flow Testing	100.00 per hydrant test
Damage to City facilities	Repair cost plus 40%

2. Sanitary Sewer service

Sewer rates	
Volume charge Per 100 cu feet	~~3.72~~ **3.80**
Base monthly fee	~~3.63~~ **3.70**
Surcharges	
Excess suspended solids	~~0.177/lb~~ **0.41/lb > 200 mg/1**
Excess biochemical oxygen demand	~~0.182/lb~~ **0.42/lb > 200 mg/1**
Excess oil and grease	~~0.20/lb~~ **0.76/lb > 50 mg/1**
Commercial preparer or server of food	0.10 per 100 cu feet
Sewage Sampling fee	75.00
Late fee	10%

Sewer Capacity benefit charges

Meter size (inch):		
5/8 & 3/4	~~1,550.00~~	**1581.00**
1	~~4,020.00~~	**4100.00**
1 & ½	~~8,090.00~~	**8252.00**
2	~~13,090.00~~	**13352.00**
3	~~26,100.00~~	**26622.00**
4	~~40,700.00~~	**41514.00**
6	~~81,600.00~~	**83232.00**
8	~~130,500.00~~	**133110.00**
10	~~187,900.00~~	**191658.00**

Fifty percent of the required capacity benefit charge will become due for all lots platted at time of recording. The remaining fees will become due with application for a building permit.

Interest rate on past due capacity benefit permits unpaid after 30 days	Highest rate allowable by law
New construction and Sanitary	50.00 (initial inspection)
Lateral repair inspection	50.00 (reinspection of failed work) 50.00 Inspection of existing sanitary lateral repairs
Sanitary Sewer Cleaning (jet truck)	~~280.00~~ **286.00** per hour (1 hr. min.)
Sanitary Sewer Main Video Inspection	~~280.00~~ **286.00** per hour (1 hr. min.)
Sanitary Lateral Video Inspection	~~280.00~~ **286.00** per hour (1 hr. min.)
Sanitary Sewer Manhole Inspection (vacuum method)	50.00 per manhole

Staff monitoring of private contractor Video inspection	25.00 per hour (1 hr. min.)
Sanitary Sewer Low Pressure Air Test (per City specifications)	25.00 per test section
Sanitary Sewer Main Construction (inspection services beyond normal working hours - overtime expense)	Cost to City of Oxford
Sanitary sewer Lift Station District Surcharge	Charge 50% surcharge to volume fee.
Locating service for private sanitary lateral	~~280.00~~ **286.00** per hour (1 hr min.)
Non-Compliance causing blockage or damage to City facilities	Response or repair cost plus 40%
Special Wastewater Discharge Application (tank pumping, groundwater,etc.)	25.00
Special Wastewater Contaminated Discharge Treatment	~~11.16~~ **11.40** per 100 cubic feet
Damage to City facilities	Repair costs plus 40%

3. Refuse service

~~Residential Rates include 2.95 Recycle fee or 4.00 fee with larger 65 gallon container:~~

~~Service type~~	~~Monthly charge~~
~~Residential service (Single family or multi-unit dwellings with four or less units)~~	~~17.60~~
~~65 gallon Recycle container rental~~	~~1.05~~
~~Hand Service refuse~~	~~37.00~~
~~Hand Service recycling~~	~~13.00~~
~~Waste-wheeler~~	~~17.60~~
~~Waste-wheeler rental~~	~~3.00~~
~~Move in/out solid waste removal Fee for all dwelling units with Rental permits within the Mile Square "Plus" area, as designated by section 931.02 of the Oxford Codified Ordinance, excluding multiple dwelling units utilizing commercial dumpsters.~~	~~2.10~~

~~Commercial Service (solid waste) monthly charge for pick up 1 time per week~~

~~Service type~~	~~Monthly charge~~
~~Waste-wheeler customer~~	~~24.90~~
~~Waste-wheeler rental~~	~~9.00~~
~~Two cubic yard dumpster~~	~~55.25~~
~~Two cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~14.00~~
~~Three cubic yard dumpster~~	~~73.80~~
~~Three cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~17.00~~
~~Four cubic yard dumpster~~	~~95.55~~
~~Four cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~20.00~~
~~Six cubic yard dumpster~~	~~140.60~~
~~Six cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~23.00~~
~~Eight cubic yard dumpster~~	~~185.00~~
~~Eight cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~26.00~~

~~Monthly charge for each additional pick up requested per week in addition to the 1 time per week charge.~~

~~Service type~~	~~Monthly charge~~
~~Waste-wheeler customer~~	~~17.60~~
~~Two cubic yard dumpster~~	~~46.00~~
~~Three cubic yard dumpster~~	~~60.00~~
~~Four cubic yard dumpster~~	~~79.00~~
~~Six cubic yard dumpster~~	~~114.00~~
~~Eight cubic yard dumpster~~	~~148.00~~

~~Recycling~~	
~~Waste wheeler~~	~~10.40~~
~~Waste wheeler rental~~	~~9.00~~
~~Two cubic yard dumpster~~	~~36.00~~
~~Two cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~14.00~~
~~Three cubic yard dumpster~~	~~48.00~~
~~Three cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~17.00~~
~~Four cubic yard dumpster~~	~~60.00~~
~~Four cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~20.00~~
~~Six cubic yard dumpster~~	~~82.00~~
~~Six cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~23.00~~
~~Eight cubic yard dumpster~~	~~99.00~~
~~Eight cubic yard dumpster rental~~	~~26.00~~

Service Type	Monthly Charge
Hand Service refuse	37.00
Hand Service recycling	13.00
65 gallon recycle container rental	1.05
Move in/out solid waste removal Fee for all dwelling units with Rental permits within the Mile Square "Plus" area, as designated by section 931.02 of the Oxford Codified Ordinance, excluding multiple dwelling units utilizing commercial dumpsters.	**3.00**

Refuse	Rumpke	Admin	Total
Residential	**11.45**	**5.65**	**17.10**
(Single family or multi-unit dwellings with four or less units) units)			
Rental for Waste wheeler	3.00	-	3.00
Residential rates include 2.95 Recycle fee			
Commercial			
2 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	**34.00**	**16.75**	**50.75**
2x/week	**54.00**	**26.65**	**80.65**
3x/week	**81.00**	**39.90**	**120.90**
4x/week	**105.00**	**51.60**	**156.60**
5x/week	**131.00**	**64.50**	**195.50**
6x/week	**157.00**	**77.45**	**234.45**
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	**25.00**	**12.30**	**37.30**
Rental fee	**14.00**	-	**14.00**
3 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	**44.00**	**21.65**	**65.65**
2x/week	**78.00**	**38.40**	**116.40**
3x/week	**113.00**	**55.60**	**168.60**
4x/week	**148.00**	**73.00**	**221.00**
5x/week	**182.00**	**89.50**	**271.50**
6x/week	**217.00**	**106.75**	**323.75**
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	**25.00**	**12.30**	**37.30**
Rental fee	**17.00**	-	**17.00**

4 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	57.00	28.10	85.10
2x/week	101.00	49.85	150.85
3x/week	145.00	71.55	216.55
4x/week	190.00	93.70	283.70
5x/week	234.00	115.50	349.50
6x/week	277.00	136.50	413.50
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	30.00	14.80	44.80
Rental fee	20.00	-	20.00
6 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	85.00	41.80	126.80
2x/week	147.00	72.40	219.40
3x/week	209.00	102.90	311.90
4x/week	259.00	127.80	386.80
5x/week	337.00	165.80	502.80
6x/week	401.00	197.45	598.45
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	35.00	17.25	52.25
Rental fee	23.00	-	23.00
8 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	112.00	55.05	167.05
2x/week	194.00	95.47	289.47
3x/week	275.00	135.72	410.72
4x/week	357.00	175.61	532.61
5x/week	438.00	216.20	654.20
6x/week	520.00	256.38	776.38
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	35.00	17.25	52.25
Rental fee	26.00	-	26.00
Waste wheeler			
1x/week	14.00	6.90	20.90
2x/week	24.00	11.80	35.80
3x/week	34.00	16.75	50.75
4x/week	44.00	21.70	65.70
5x/week	54.00	26.65	80.65
6x/week	64.00	31.50	95.50
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	10.00	4.95	14.95
Rental fee	9.00	-	9.00

Recycling	Rumpke	Admin	Total
2 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	36.00	-	36.00
2x/week	52.00	-	52.00
3x/week	66.00	-	66.00
4x/week	82.00	-	82.00
5x/week	96.00	-	96.00
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	20.00	-	20.00
Rental fee	14.00	-	14.00
3 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	48.00	-	48.00
2x/week	70.00	-	70.00
3x/week	92.00	-	92.00
4x/week	116.00	-	116.00
5x/week	138.00	-	138.00
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	20.00	-	20.00
Rental fee	17.00	-	17.00
4 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	60.00	-	60.00
2x/week	90.00	-	90.00
3x/week	120.00	-	120.00
4x/week	150.00	-	150.00
5x/week	180.00	-	180.00
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	25.00	-	25.00
Rental fee	20.00	-	20.00
6 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	82.00	-	82.00
2x/week	125.00	-	125.00
3x/week	169.00	-	169.00
4x/week	214.00	-	214.00
5x/week	260.00	-	260.00
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	25.00	-	25.00
Rental fee	23.00	-	23.00
8 Cubic Yard dumpster			
1x/week	99.00	-	99.00
2x/week	159.00	-	159.00
3x/week	219.00	-	219.00
4x/week	279.00	-	279.00

5x/week	**339.00**	-	**339.00**
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	**30.00**	-	**30.00**
Rental fee	**26.00**	-	**26.00**
Waste wheeler			
1x/week	**12.00**	-	**12.00**
2x/week	**18.00**	-	**18.00**
3x/week	**24.00**	-	**24.00**
4x/week	**30.00**	-	**30.00**
5x/week	**36.00**	-	**36.00**
Requested extra pick up (outside of normal schedule)	**10.00**	-	**10.00**
Rental fee	**9.00**	-	**9.00**

Late fee 10%

One-time additional pickup permit stickers 10.00 per Sticker

~~Yard Waste Stickers 3.00 per Sticker~~

Compactor Tickets 45.00 per 1 Cu. Yd.

4.Video service provider fee 5% of annual gross revenue

5. Miscellaneous

DVD Copies 5.00

G. ENGINEERING DIVISION

1) Design manual fees:

Water and Sanitary Sewer Improvement Specifications	30.00
Storm Water Management Design	20.00
Digital city standard drawings	15.00 per compact disc

2) Map Order

Media:

Bond	8&1/2 x 11	B/W	4.00
Bond	8&1/2 x 11	Color	4.00
Bond	11 x 17	B/W	4.00
Bond	11 x 17	Color	4.50
Bond	24 x 36	B/W	10.00
Bond	24 x 36	Color	11.00

Bond	36 x 48	B/W	18.00
Bond	36 x 48	Color	20.00
Mylar	24 x 36	B/W	12.00
Mylar	24 x 36	Color	14.00
Mylar	36 x 48	B/W	20.00
Mylar	36 x 48	Color	22.00

Dry Mounted

24 x 36	NA	10.00 + map fee
36 x 48	NA	22.00 + map fee

Base and Zoning maps

Lots	5.00	plus media cost
Oxford Historic District	1.00	plus media cost
Corporation limits	Free	
Water lines	5.00	plus media cost
Sewer lines	5.00	plus media cost

Base and Zoning maps (continued)

Storm sewer lines	5.00	plus media cost
Zoning	5.00	plus media cost
Proposed development	5.00	plus media cost
Additional use permits	5.00	plus media cost
P.U.D.'s	5.00	plus media cost
Special use permits	5.00	plus media cost
Street index	1.00	plus media cost
Digital base map section	15.00	per diskette

3) Plans and Specifications Sales (depending on the size of the project) — 20.00 to 500.00

4) Document handling/forwarding fee to regulating agencies — 25.00

5) Engineering plan review for revisions after 2nd submittal. — 100.00 per submission

H. STREET DIVISION

Street cut surface repair

April through November
Up to 40 sq.ft. - ~~$100.00~~ **128.00**
(or 40 linear ft of curb totaling less than 40 sq. ft.)
>40 sq.ft. - ~~$100.00~~ **128.00** + ~~2.50~~ **3.20** per additional sq.ft.
December through March
Add 50% to costs above

Brick Street Repair - $30.00 per sq. ft.

Work without a permit in ROW (Starting construction or without a permit)

Greater of $200.00 or twice the cost of the permit fee

Street Tree Permits

No charge

Removal of hazardous trees from private property	At cost to city plus 5% Administrative fee
Street Spills	Cost of time and materials for cleanup + 10% Administrative Fee
Right-of-way Requests	
Personnel (misc. tasks)	25.00 hr
Event Electrician	100.00+ necessary materials at cost
Road Closures/Detours	135.00
Event Trash cans	5.00
Street Signs	Cost of labor/materials used + 10% administrative fee
Woodside Cemetery gravesite plots	100.00
Woodside Cemetery gravesite	250.00 Opening and closing
After 3:30 Monday-Friday And weekends	Additional 100.00
Street Banner Installation And removal	Single banner 100.00
Damage to City Facilities	Costs plus 40%

I. FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Misc. Copies	
per copy	.10 per Page
Final Annual Budget Document	
Paper	At cost to City
Electronic	5.00 per DVD/CD
Any Other Method	At cost to City
Comprehensive Annual Financial Report	
Paper	At cost to City
Electronic	5.00 per DVD/CD
Any Other Method	At cost to city
Hotel tax rates:	
Hotel tax	3.00%
Convention tax	3.00%
Motor vehicle license tax	5.00 per motor vehicle
Motor Coach or Bus (Each)	25.00 per Year
Taxicab ~~(Each)~~ **per vehicle**	~~10.00~~ **25.00** per Year
~~Minimum fee per company~~	~~25.00 per Year~~

Vendor License	50.00 per Calendar Month, or 300.00 per Year
NSF check Fee	At cost to City
Collections Fee on Delinquent Accounts	
Phase I	10.00 per written off account
Phase II	45% of the amount due on accounts more than $250.00 35% of the amount due on accounts less than $250.00
Dog License	0.75 per Tag (City Share), plus amount charged by County

J. HUMAN RESOURCES

Non refundable Civil Service Exam Fee 15.00

SECTION 2: Council hereby accepts the recommendation of the City Manager and authorizes the adoption of the fees as contained herein. Additionally, the Council authorizes the City Manager to implement changes to existing fees or add new fees as deemed appropriate.

SECTION 3: This ordinance repeals ordinance adopted by the City of Oxford, but does not repeal the enabling language of the legislation by which these fees were previously adopted, which language shall otherwise remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 4: This ordinance shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

_____
MAYOR

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK OF OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

INTRODUCED BY: KEVIN MCKEEHAN

PREPARED BY: LAW (STAFF)